THE DISCIPLES DIVINITY HOUSE
OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

HERBERT LOCKWOOD WILLETT
LIBRARY

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2012 with funding from
CARLI: Consortium of Academic and Research Libraries in Illinois

http://www.archive.org/details/christianunionqu16unse

FEDERAL COUNCIL NUMBER
VOL. XVI. No. 1 JULY, 1926

"God gave unto us the Ministry of Reconciliation"

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

INTERDENOMINATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL

CONTENTS

The Editor's Notes:
The Why of Federal Union—An Expression of Growing Unity—A Laboratory for Needed Experiment—Range of Service—Unity in Diversity—Is Co-operation an Expense or an Economy?—Community Co-operation—Shall We Federate the Federations?—The Federal Council and the Churches of Europe—International Co-operation—Voluntary Service

The Soul of the Federal Council . . . WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN

How the Federal Council Can Best Serve the Churches . . . . . ROBERT E. SPEER

Church Federation a Necessity . . . . EDWARD TALLMADGE ROOT

The Growth of American Church Federation . . S. PARKES CADMAN

The Present Status of Local Federation . . . . ROY B. GUILD

A Layman's View of Christian Service Through Co-operation . . . . . THEODORE CHRISTIANSON

Members of Christ's Body . . . . . GEORGE C. PIDGEON

The Secretarial Staff of the Federal Council . . . . . .

What People and Papers are Saying
The Federal Council Through the Eyes of Church Leaders—The Federal Council Through the Eyes of Laymen—The Federal Council Through the Eyes of the Religious Press—The Federal Council Through Foreign Eyes—The Community Church—Finding Our Unity in Common Service—The Attitude of Educated India Toward Christianity — The Episcopal-Catholic Movement — Can America Help the Near Eastern Churches?—The Church and World Unity—The Practice of Comity—What True Tolerance Is—Christian Unity in Practice—What a Local Church Council Tries to Do—Community Church Workers Meet

Book Reviews
Toward Interracial Co-operation—The Supremacy of the Spiritual—The Reasonableness of Christianity—Paul of Tarsus—Mathilda Wrede of Finland, etc.

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY, Inc.
504 N. FULTON AVE., BALTIMORE, MD., U. S. A.
AGENTS:
Fleming H. Revell Company, New York
Maruzen Company, Ltd., Tokyo, Osaka, Kyoto, Fukuoka and Sendai

CONTENTS

JULY, 1926

VOL. XVI. No. 1.

THE EDITOR'S NOTES 5

THE SOUL OF THE FEDERAL COUNCIL ..... WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN 13

HOW THE FEDERAL COUNCIL CAN BEST SERVE THE CHURCHES. ROBERT E. SPEER 21

CHURCH FEDERATION A NECESSITY ..... EDWARD TALLMADGE ROOT 27

THE GROWTH OF AMERICAN CHURCH FEDERATION ..... S. PARKES CADMAN 35

THE PRESENT STATUS OF LOCAL FEDERATION ..... ROY B. GUILD 39

A LAYMAN'S VIEW OF CHRISTIAN SERVICE THROUGH CO-OPERATION ..... THEODORE CHRISTIANSON 46

MEMBERS OF CHRIST'S BODY ... GEORGE C. PIDGEON 49

THE SECRETARIAL STAFF OF THE FEDERAL COUNCIL 60

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING 62

BOOK REVIEWS 105

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

504 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore, Md., U. S. A.

CONTRIBUTED ARTICLES:—THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY is open to contributions from all Christians—Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Protestant, and all other Christians who accept Jesus as Lord and Saviour. It is entirely immaterial whether these contributions agree or disagree with the Editor's position, or the position of any contributor. We are seeking to bring together those who differ, for unless we frankly face our differences, and think them through, we shall never agree. THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY welcomes to its Forum all Ministers of Reconciliation.

PRICE:—The price of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY, published in January, April, July, and October, is seventy-five cents a single copy, or two dollars and fifty cents a year, in the United States and all parts of the world. A local church of any communion contributing annually $5.00 or more to THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY EXTENSION FUND will be entitled to receive two copies of THE QUARTERLY free for one year—one copy going to the minister and the other copy to some designated person or institution.

Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office at Baltimore, Md.

A Statement

THIS journal is the organ of no party other than those, growing up in all parties, who are interested in the Unity of the Church of Christ. Its pages are free to all indications of Christian Unity and Ventures of Faith. It maintains that, whether so accepted or not, all Christians—Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Protestant, and all others who accept Jesus as Lord and Saviour—are parts of the Church of Christ and that their Equality before God is the paramount issue of modern times.

Such a journal must, necessarily, be unofficial in its attempt to be an Interpreter of the mind of the churches and in furnishing a Forum for better understanding and cordial appreciation between the divided, and sometimes far isolated, communions of Christendom. It, thereby, seeks to contribute something to clear the way to the Altar of Reconciliation.

It does not hold itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors, except in a very general way as to their character and general attitude; but it invites to its pages such contributions of thought as will, on one hand, help in the removal of misunderstandings, and, on the other, create an atmosphere where our differences may be frankly faced and freely discussed in Christian Fellowship.

All contributors are allowed the same freedom in the expression of their thoughts, as the Editor exercises for himself. He does not anticipate that others will always approve his thoughts, any more than he presumes to assume responsibility for the thoughts of others; but every writer is responsible for what appears above his own name. We are to be free to think and equally free to let think, until, in corporate thinking and corporate praying, we find the Road to Brotherhood.

Consequently, this journal is not only not the organ of any party in Christendom; but, likewise, it is not the exponent of any theory of Christian Unity. It follows the reality in personal experience of spiritual growth in Christ—growing up in Him and toward other Christians as we find the Truth, which shall free us from suspicion, prejudice, pride, and unlove. Then we shall be able to interpret Christ in those terms which He expressed in his own words,—"By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have Love one to another."

The Christian Union Quarterly

Edited by Peter Ainslie, D. D.

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

DR. HAMILCAR ALIVISATOS,
Athens, Greece.

BISHOP CHARLES P. ANDERSON,
Chicago, Ill.

REV. NEHEMIAH BOYNTON, D.D.,
New York, N. Y.

BISHOP CHARLES H. BRENT,
Buffalo, N. Y.

DEAN CHARLES R. BROWN,
New Haven, Conn.

PROF. WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN,
New York, N. Y.

REV. RAYMOND CALKINS, D.D.,
Cambridge, Mass.

BISHOP JAMES CANNON, JR.,
Washington, D. C.

PROF. DR. J. EUGENE CHOISY,
Geneva, Switzerland.

REV. S. D. CHOWN, D.D.,
Toronto, Canada.

DR. FRANCIS E. CLARK,
Boston, Mass.

DR. J. A. CRAMER,
Utrecht, Holland.

PROF. DR. ADOLF DEISSMANN,
Berlin, Germany.

REV. A. W. FORTUNE, D.D.,
Lexington, Kentucky

DEAN H. E. W. FOSBROKE,
New York, N. Y.

DEAN W. E. GARRISON,
Chicago, Ill.

PRINCIPAL ALFRED E. GARVIE,
London, England.

MOST REV. METROPOLITAN GERMANOS,
Thyatira, Asia Minor.

PRESIDENT W. A. HARPER,
Elon College, N. C.

DR. HENRY T. HODGKIN,
Shanghai, China.

REV. FINIS S. IDLEMAN, D.D.,
New York, N. Y.

DEAN W. R. INGE,
London, England.

PROF. RUFUS M. JONES,
Haverford, Pa.

BISHOP EDWIN S. LINES,
Newark, N. J.

DR. FREDERICK LYNCH,
New York, N. Y.

VERY REV. J. A. M'CLYMONT, D.D.,
Edinburgh, Scotland.

PROF. SAMUEL MCCOMB,
Cambridge, Mass.

BISHOP FRANCIS J. MCCONNELL,
Pittsburgh, Pa.

BISHOP WILLIAM F. MCDOWELL,
Washington, D. C.

THE BISHOP OF MANCHESTER,
Manchester, England.

REV. WILLIAM P. MERRILL, D.D.,
New York, N. Y.

DR. WILFRED MONOD,
Paris, France.

DR. JOHN R. MOTT,
New York, N. Y.

BISHOP HARALD OSTENFELD,
Copenhagen, Denmark.

BISHOP EDWARD L. PARSONS,
San Francisco, Calif.

PROF. ARTHUR S. PEAKE,
Manchester, England.

PRESIDENT GEORGE W. RICHARDS,
Lancaster, Pa.

PRINCIPAL W. B. SELBIE,
Oxford, England.

REV. J. H. SHAKESPEARE, D.D.,
London, England.

PASTOR DR. FRIEDRICH SIEGMUND-SCHULTZE,
Berlin, Germany.

DR. ROBERT E. SPEER,
New York, N. Y.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF UPSALA,
Upsala, Sweden.

DR. HENRY VAN DYKE,
Princeton, N. J.

REV. JOSEPH A. VANCE, D.D.,
Detroit, Mich.

BISHOP BOYD VINCENT,
Cincinnati, Ohio.

BISHOP LUTHER B. WILSON,
New York, N. Y.

BL
1

OUR VARIOUS DENOMINATIONS AND SECTS AROSE LARGELY FROM THE DEMAND FOR FREEDOM, AND THROUGH MUCH SUFFERING WE FOUND OUR FREEDOM. WE ARE NOW RECOGNIZING AS DENOMINATIONS, HOWEVER, THAT THE HIGHEST FREEDOM WE POSSESS MAY BE THE FREEDOM TO GIVE UP SOME OF OUR FREEDOM FOR THE SAKE OF THE COMMON GOOD. THIS WAS THE KIND OF FREEDOM TO WHICH PAUL REFERRED IN HIS DISCUSSION OF THOSE DENOMINATIONAL DIFFERENCES WHICH HAD ALREADY BEGUN IN THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH. WE ARE READY TO ACKNOWLEDGE, WITHOUT FORGETTING PERHAPS THAT IN OUR INTELLECTUAL EXPRESSION OF TRUTH WE HAVE BEEN OF APOLLOS OR CEPHAS, THAT WE ARE ALL OF CHRIST, AND THAT IN ALLEGIANCE TO HIM WE MUST MAINTAIN OR REGAIN UNITY EVEN IN THE MIDST OF OUR DIVERSITY. WE ARE FOLLOWING STILL FARTHER OUR DENOMINATIONAL SEARCH FOR FREEDOM, AND ARE SEEKING THIS HIGHEST FREEDOM IN OUR MODERN MOVEMENTS TOWARD CHRISTIAN UNITY.

—CHARLES S. MACFARLAND *in The Progress of Church Federation.*

1503

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

JULY, 1926

THE EDITOR'S NOTES

The Why of Federal Union

If it had been given to the group of Christian leaders who attended the Conference on Church Federation in Carnegie Hall, New York, in 1905, to pierce the future and to discern to what proportions their plans would grow in twenty years, few of them would have thought it credible. One cannot review the development of those two decades without feeling that something more than the hand of man has been behind it. "In the *Providence of God* the time has come more fully to manifest the essential oneness of the Christian Churches of America," was the initial declaration made in the Plan of Federation adopted at that time. Subsequent history has justified this faith.

Why has the Federal Council of the Churches commanded the abiding loyalty of thoughtful men and women during these twenty years? Not simply because the Council is a useful piece of machinery. That it is, but vastly more. It is, in its essential purpose, profoundly spiritual in character, a way of making clear to the world that, in spite of superficial differences, the churches are truly one in all the deep realities that matter most. Through the Council they have been bearing practical testimony, through united service, to their common conviction that in Jesus Christ they all alike possess the one adequate resource for meeting the deepest needs of the individual and of society.

That practical unity is a clamant need of our day none can doubt. Our Protestant emphasis on freedom, which for four hundred years has so richly blessed the world, has had this one unhappy consequence: It has left the Body of Christ split into a host of separated fragments. A needless weakness both in our

witness to the world and in our programme for the world has been the result.

All our churches, of whatever name, are trying to bear witness to the world that there is one God who is our common Father and one Lord who is the Saviour of all. This, we have been declaring, means that brotherhood, fellowship, unity, are the Divine will for humanity. But can we expect the world at large actually to believe this message of the churches unless the churches give evidence of really believing it themselves? And can the churches be regarded by the world as truly believing it unless they know how to practice it in their relations to each other? The churches earnestly desire to call individuals, classes, nations, and races into true fellowship and brotherly co-operation; can they hope to do so unless, in their own life, they show that trustful living together and working together are really practicable? It is too much to expect that the churches will have their true power in rebuilding social and international relationships on a co-operative basis until they have solved these problems for themselves.

In their programme of work also, the weakness of unrelated denominational activities grows daily more apparent. In the small town this is most obvious. What sorry inefficiency is exhibited by a half-dozen churches trying to eke out a competitive existence in a community where one strong church would give an immeasurably stronger ministry of Christian service! In the large city lack of co-operation is no less serious. No church knows for what section of the city it is responsible or whether any church is assuming a responsibility for a certain area. The result is that great areas, especially in the downtown and congested districts, are utterly overlooked, the Methodists assuming that the Presbyterians will care for them, the Presbyterians leaving it to the Baptists, the Baptists to somebody else. Most serious of all, in the community, the nation, or the world, the churches cannot strongly influence public opinion along Christian lines except as they act in a concerted and cohesive way. The inharmonious voices of many churches do not appear to be the voice of the Church at all. No thoughtful person can dispute the statement that "Protestantism must

achieve an increasing unity or be content with a decreasing influence."

An Expression of Growing Unity

Can we not preserve our cherished freedom and at the same time freely use it in the interest of a more united life and work? The conviction that such a blending of freedom and unity is possible is what led the churches to the creation of the Federal Council. The growing realization of this ideal is what leads to their continued support of the Council. They believe that the *federal* way is the great method by which a larger unity is to be attained. They are trying to achieve in the religious realm what our forefathers brought about in the political realm, a free association based upon common interests and common goals. If Massachusetts and New York and Virginia had been expected to surrender any of the distinctive values that had come to them in the course of their history, we would not yet have a United States of America. But in the development of an inclusive union, in which each preserved all its rich treasures from the past, a growing solidarity was possible. Not otherwise will it be in the churches.

A Laboratory for Needed Experiment

And in the churches, as in the American colonies, it is a realization of great tasks to be performed which cannot be performed by isolated action that is the mightiest spur to federation. If the function of the churches is exhausted in furnishing comfort and inspiration to the individual, unity will hardly seem a fundamental need. One man will find such help in the communion service of the Episcopal Church, another in the Quaker silence, another in the Methodist prayer meeting. But if there is also the supreme goal of building the Kingdom of God in the whole life of the community, the nation, and the world, then a consolidation of Christian forces is absolutely indispensable. It is related of a British prime minister that, when he desired to get his fellow-countrymen to give up a provincial outlook and think in imperial terms, he addressed Par-

liament in these words: "Gentlemen, *you must study larger maps!*" When we begin to examine the larger maps for Christianizing all our social, racial, and international life, then federation is seen as an imperious call to the churches.

Range of Service

The names of the departments and commissions of the Federal Council of Churches indicate in themselves the wide range of the Council's service. Based on personal and pastoral evangelism, developed under the principles of Christian education, with a department of research to gather information on the great issues of humanity, the Council reaches out in accord with its constitution in "the application of the principles of the Gospel to every relation of human life." So we find it working in the field of friendly race relations, including black and white, and good-will between Jews and Christians; to social service and industrial relations; and extending its influence world-wide in the interest of international justice and good-will reaching out to relations with the Orient.

During the past ten years these great issues have been made the programme throughout the nation in state and local federations including religious work on the Canal Zone. Meanwhile the Council has been the example and inspiration of a co-operative movement that has become world-wide; has secured assistance for and established relations with religious bodies in Europe, and within the past month has named an ambassador of friendly relations with the Eastern Churches. Legion is the name of some lesser but yet important service in mercy and relief, in helping Army and Navy chaplains, and other co-operative tasks.

As one looks over this range of service, vast as it is, there is not one field or activity that is not obviously a common, and not merely a denominational, task.

Unity in Diversity

We doubt if history records any similar movement that has developed at one and the same time so rapidly and so safely

as the Federal Council. As we recall that one little room at the Bible House, where Dr. Sanford toiled with the help of one stenographer, and contrast it with the staff and service of the Federal Council to-day, we venture to say that future history will record it as one of the greatest religious developments of the century.

And yet it has differed from other efforts for unity by its conservatism and caution. Wise leaders have watched for the signs of the times. The Federal Council has dealt with delicate and often controversial problems. But it has never been set back on its course. The decisions of the quadrennial meetings, the annual meetings of the Executive Committee, and the monthly meetings of the Administrative Committee have always been completely or practically unanimous. Anyone attending these meetings and noting the discussion can see the reason. There has been serious and prayerful thinking and consultation before these measures are brought forward. Wise principles of policy give the unity so needed when the problems dealt with are characterized by such diversity as those represented in the departments and commissions of the Federal Council.

Is Co-operation an Expense or an Economy?

The writer can remember that early budget of the Federal Council about 1910. It was about $15,000. It now reaches to over $300,000. Is this a tax or an economy for the churches? Dr. Speer once answered this question by reminding the Council that he knew of one denomination whose budget for co-ordinating its own work was more than $400,000 and asked whether or not that was too much for co-ordinating the service of thirty denominations. It is obvious that the work done by the Council would cost many times more if the denominations did it independently, even if they could do it in isolation, but it is equally obvious they could not.

Community Co-operation

At recent annual meetings the secretaries of the local federations and councils of churches have urged their case with

insistence and eloquence. The movement must be decentralized, in the sense that it must now have geographical distribution. They are right. And yet there are two considerations at this point.

When the editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly* began his Christian unity tours about ten years ago, local co-operation in any organized form was very rare. Compare this with the strong and effective local federations in half a hundred cities, not to mention a hundred or more of voluntary nature. The progress has been marvelous.

The second consideration is this: The Federal Council built wisely and well when it laid as its foundation the denominational bodies. For example, compare or contrast it with the Free Church Council of Great Britain erected loosely on local groups.

The Federal Council has spent its first effective decade wisely in bringing together the denominations themselves and has made itself a representative body with authority in the best sense of the word. Had it not done this, it never could have reached its present permanency and power. Attempts have been made to build and develop co-operation in other ways and they were abortive. So long as denominations exist the Federal Council must rest on them and derive power from them.

The Federal Council has thus established its roots in its constituent bodies and has expressed in national terms the great co-operative tasks of the churches. Because of this it is now prepared to do what could not be done ten years ago, namely, to get its consciousness, its ideals, and its programmes to the local communities and churches. The next decade, we venture to say, will parallel the last, but in a different area.

Shall We Federate the Federations?

All friends of Christian co-operation have been gratified by the negotiations for unifying the work of the Federal Council and the Home Missions Council. It is clear that this can only be done by unifying the organizations. When this comes up, we always hear the question: "Why not all the interdenominational organizations?"

Perhaps we are in too much haste, but we are unable to see why the Federal Council, the Home Missions Council, the Committee of Reference and Counsel of the Foreign Missions Conference of North America, the International Council of Religious Education, the Council of Church Boards of Education; the Women's Councils of Foreign and Home Missions should not become a unified body, with sufficient departmental freedom, of course, but thinking out and planning the whole task together, just as the denominations are more and more doing. We venture to prophesy that it will come and, as we go about among the churches, we are constantly asked why it does not.

The Federal Council and the Churches of Europe

The Federal Council has not sought to do work *in* Europe but to render service *for* Europe. It began in 1915 when the general secretary visited the churches of the war-stricken countries . It ended in the establishment of the Central Bureau for the Relief of the Evangelical Churches of Europe, which has greatly helped to save the churches and religious institutions of Europe from dissolution. Dr. Speer, while president of the Council, constantly urged "service" as the keynote of the Federal Council and the attitude of the Council toward Europe is a fine illustration of a truly co-operative and serving spirit.

International Co-operation

The Federal Council has never sought to assume leadership in the international movement. Some have thought it ought to have done so. It called the preliminary conference on Life and Work at Geneva in 1920 at the common request of the committee which met in Paris and then retired as an organization.

Nevertheless people in all parts of the world know that its potency and influence has been and is a vital source of international co-operation as exemplified in the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work. As Archbishop Söderblom wrote in a recent letter,—"it could never have been brought about but for the Federal Council."

We venture to predict that whatever may develop in the new relationship between the Eastern Churches and the Evangelical Churches, will come largely from the Federal Council, and we rejoice that American Christianity is to have so able a statesman as Dr. Peet for this task. With Dr. Keller in Zurich and Dr. Peet in Athens we shall look for a new era in international Christian co-operation. It is our conviction that the Continuation Committee on Life and Work should encourage very fully these relationships as well as its own with the Federal Council.

Voluntary Service

The Federal Council has a "Secretariat," as Dr. Cadman calls it, of devoted men (and two women, of whom there will be more). They are often there when not in evidence. But what we have noted has been the extent to which this staff has developed and used voluntary service. We do not know who had a hand in their original selection (we have sometimes had our suspicion that somebody knew how to pick men), but look at the service, not honourary nor ornamental, but the real service of such men as Presidents Hendrix, Mathews, North, Speer, and now the magnitude of Cadman's. Leaders of the denominations have rendered constant service through the Federal Council to the Church at large.

Neither must it be overlooked that in Charles S. Macfarland, and later in Samuel McCrea Cavert, in association with him, the Federal Council has maintained a secretariat that has been characterized by ability, fidelity, fairness, and co-operation, thereby putting all who have been associated with the Federal Council under obligation to their leadership.

What wonder that the Federal Council has made steady advance when those responsible for it bring into play the combined thinking and action of such men. We doubt if any denomination has ever surpassed the Federal Council in this policy of getting real and actual voluntary service. It is one of the secrets of its power.

PETER AINSLIE.

THE SOUL OF THE FEDERAL COUNCIL

BY WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN, D.D.

Professor of Systematic Theology in the Union Theological Seminary, New York

I BELIEVE in the Federal Council of the Churches with all my heart. I believe in what it is doing now; I believe still more in what it yet may do if we, who see its splendid possibilities, do our part to help it to become its best self.

Every living thing is body and soul; a piece of mechanism that we see functioning in various ways, and an inner spirit that gives direction to its activities and expresses what we call its ideal.

This is true of people. What is a person? From one point of view, a piece of machinery, an engine with a furnace, a boiler, a piston, and wheels; from another, a center of vital energy, a fire that burns within and generates steam and makes the wheels go 'round. And you cannot rightly adapt yourself to the body which you see until you have learned to understand the soul which you cannot see.

What is true of individuals is just as true of the social groups in which they combine. It is true of the nation. Our country has an outer and an inner side. It has laws and a constitution and a history that you can write down and read about in books and compare with other bodies of law and other histories. But if it were no more than this our grandfathers would never have fought the battle of Bunker Hill, or our fathers the Civil War, or our sons the World War, and Katherine Lee Bates would never have written her hymn, "O, Beautiful My Country."

What is true of the nation as a whole is true of the smaller groups which it contains, the committees and clubs and parties to which we all belong. And it is true as well of the larger and

more comprehensive organizations through which nations are united. It is true, for example, of the League of Nations. When I was in London a few years ago, I met Wilfred Grenfell, the well-known missionary to Labrador. He had just returned from a visit to Geneva where he had been attending the session of the Assembly of the League. I asked him what were his impressions. "Don't worry about the League of Nations," he said to me, "it is sure to succeed in the end. It has a soul, and it is the only thing in Europe that has." I believe that Wilfred Grenfell was right. The League of Nations is not only a piece of machinery, a covenant with its laws, but a group of people animated by a common ideal, and the chief reason why we have not yet been able to work out the right relation to it in this country is because we have tried to define an attitude toward a piece of mechanism, which is the body of the League, without having adjusted our spirits to the ideals which constitute its soul.

So, in what I say about the Federal Council, I want to begin with the inward and unseen part, that intangible, indefinable, but none the less real and important side of the Council which I have called its soul. I want to help you to realize it not as it is to-day, a piece of mechanism functioning more or less imperfectly, but as it appears to the hearts and minds of those who are working in it and through it for ends that seem to them precious and enduring. Only as we have gained this vantage ground shall we be in a position to ask how the existing machinery serves these ends and what you and I can do, if we approve them, to make the machinery better and more effective than it is.

I shall ask you, then, to think of the Council first as a *symbol,* secondly as a *fact,* and thirdly as an *opportunity.*

The Council as a Symbol

The well-known sociologist, Professor Eduard C. Lindeman, in his *Social Discovery,* has been reminding us of the symbolic character of language. Words are signs which call up in our mind pictures of the realities they represent, and the same

word may represent different things to different people. It is so with the Federal Council. To some of you the Federal Council represents an organization which is all the time sending you literature which crowds your study table and speedily finds its way into the scrap-basket. To others it calls up a picture of a group of persons, more or less congenial, who are trying to interest you in things that you do not have time to do. To still others, it is a piece of machinery, perhaps rather complicated and clumsy, of the importance of which you are not convinced and which in the practical work of life competes for your attention with other interests that seem to you more worth while. And there are some, it may be, to whom it calls up no picture at all. But to those of us who are working in the Federal Council it has a different meaning. *It stands for the kind of church that we would all like to have if we could have our heart's desire, the church that in our best moments we know that we must have if we are to realize Christ's ideal for the world.*

What kind of a church would we like to have? It would be a church that could combine two sets of qualities which in experience we seldom find together, the quality of variety and the quality of unity. For one thing, we would like a church that meets our particular religious needs in the form that is natural and congenial to us, a church which would give us a liturgy if we are Episcopalians, or free prayer if we are Methodists; a clear-cut creed if we are Presbyterians, or freedom from all creeds if we are Baptists, and so on all along the line. But at the same time we want a church that would express the unity of all Christians, those who differ from us as well as those with whom we agree. It would be a church in which Presbyterians, Baptists, Episcopalians, Lutherans, and all the other different kinds of Christians, would feel themselves at home because the thing that was best in the particular type in which they had been brought up could find its most complete and perfect expression, but at the same time, a church that would stand to the world at large for those basic and enduring interests which unite all Christians — whatever the name by which they call themselves—and make them members of the one family of God.

Such a church does not exist in the world to-day. It is a dream, a hope, an expectation. But it is a dream which many different people are dreaming, and for which many different people are working. They do not all picture this ideal church in the same way. They do not all work for it from the same angle. One group starts from the local congregation and emphasizes the widest possible liberty in man's approach to God. It is distrustful of any powerful centralized authority. The union after which its members aspire is a union of free spirits who come together without constraint to do the things that seem to them right to do. Another group emphasizes the importance of order. To many earnest Christians in all the churches the present condition of the Church of Christ, broken into a group of rival denominations, each leading its own life in its own way, seems a travesty of the great word Christianity. They are feeling their way after some comprehensive church through which the unity of Christians may find impressive demonstration to the world. The ideal church, the church that we would like to have, would meet both these needs in ways that are adequate and satisfying. It would leave each separate group free to work out its own problems in its own way, while it would, at the same time, provide a central organization through which the aspirations that are common to all could find united and effective expression.

The Federal Council symbolizes this better church. It stands for an ideal in which the greatest measure of independence and autonomy for the co-operating units could be combined with an organization strong enough and centralized enough to make common action effective in the great things that all approve.

The Council as a Fact

So much for the soul. Now for the body. We have pictured the ideal toward which we are working. What is the machinery through which this ideal is being realized?

I can sketch only the broadest outlines. The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America is a representative

body, chosen by the highest authorities of twenty-eight different denominations, meeting quadrennially, for the following purposes:

"1. To express the fellowship and catholic unity of the Christian Church.

"2. To bring the Christian Church of America into united service for Christ and the world.

"3. To encourage devotional fellowship and mutual counsel concerning the spiritual life and religious activities of the churches.

"4. To secure a larger combined influence for the churches of Christ in all matters affecting the moral and social conditions of the people so as to promote the application of the law of Christ to every relation of human life."

The Council functions for the fulfilment of these purposes in three different ways: first, by its quadrennial meetings, which bring together the official representatives of the bodies included in the Council, for serious deliberation upon the state of the Church and its responsibility to the world. No one who has attended one of these gatherings, covering as they do the whole range of interests represented by contemporary religion, can fail to be impressed with what it means for the religious life of America that once in four years such a gathering should be held as those great meetings in Boston in 1920 and in Atlanta in 1924.

In the second place, the Council functions through its Executive Committee, a body of approximately one hundred delegates who meet once a year and are responsible for major policies; and through an Administrative Committee of slightly over fifty members who meet monthly and maintain a constant supervision over all the Council's work. The Administrative Committee includes not only members of the Council, but also representatives of various co-operating bodies, such as the Home Missions Council, the Foreign Missions Conference, the Council of Church Boards of Education, and the Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations.

In the third place, the Council functions through a number of commissions dealing with various aspects of the work of the

Church, such as evangelism, Christian education, social service, race relations, international justice and good-will, relations with European Churches, and the like. These commissions include both official representatives of the churches functioning in the fields with which the commissions deal, and other persons whose interest and experience make them valuable helpers in particular lines of work.

Four great purposes are accomplished by this organization. First, the Council serves as an indispensable means of acquaintance and understanding between Christians. In the Council and its commissions men of different denominations sit side by side for the discussion of common problems and, as a result, a consciousness of unity is created, the importance of which it is difficult to exaggerate. Not only does the Council promote fellowship between its own members, but through its commissions it is an important point of contact with other Christians who belong to communions not yet fully represented in the Council. This is notably true of two great bodies of Christians, the Lutherans and the Episcopalians, who, although they are not yet officially constituent bodies of the Council, are represented in several of its commissions and co-operate most cordially in large areas of its work.

In the second place, the Council provides an organ of expression through which the church can speak unitedly in moments of national and international tension. What it has done in voicing the Christian conscience with reference to the moral issues at stake in the World War, the Washington Conference on the Limitation of Armaments, the Japanese exclusion act, the abandonment of extraterrioriality in China, the twelve-hour day in the steel industry, and other problems is too well known to need extended discussion.

In the third place, the Council, through its commissions, furnishes an agency through which the churches can carry on unitedly special pieces of work which it is either impossible or ineffective for them to handle separately. The co-ordinated approach made by the denominational agencies to their activities in evangelism, social service, race relations, world peace, mercy and relief, is of the utmost significance. The work of the Fed-

eral Council in creating the War-Time Commission, in which virtually all the denominational agencies co-operated, is an illustration of what needs to be done in peace as well as in war and of what can be done in much fuller measure when Protestants become more conscious of the values of united action.

Finally, in the fourth place, the Council serves as a clearing house of information upon which wise policies can be based. In the research department the churches now have a central agency which is rapidly developing a high degree of skill in studying the complex problems of our economic, industrial, social, and international life, and making the results available for all denominations. The weekly "Information Service" is regarded by forward-looking ministers and social workers as rendering a unique service in its authoritative reports on contemporary events and conditions. The special bulletins on such subjects as the motion picture problem, the wage situation, the rural co-operative movement, and the prohibition situation, represent more comprehensive studies of an urgently needed character.

The Council as an Opportunity

Here is this body trying to realize the ideal of this soul, but haltingly and imperfectly because it is not adequately furnished with the resources which it needs either of men or of money. What can we do to help it to function better? There are three things that we can do. In the first place, we can understand it. We can enter into this unseen spirit of which I have been speaking so that we can sympathize intelligently with the men who are guiding the policies of the Council not only in what they are doing, but in what they are trying to do.

In the second place, we can interpret the Council to the members of our own denomination so that their support may be loyal and effective. We can help them to see that the Council is not a rival of any denomination, but an agency through which alone the ideals of the denomination can be completely realized and thereby delivered from the narrowness and ineffectiveness which are inevitable unless the individual communions are consciously working together for common ends.

In the third place, we can relate ourselves to the work of the Council. We can subscribe to its publications which keep us informed of what is going on. We can help to make the work of the Council more widely known. We can interest those who are able to help in its support, financial and moral. Above all, we can incarnate in our own lives the ideal for which it stands, the ideal of unity in variety.

The Federal Council claims our allegiance because it is the agency through which, while preserving our liberty to retain our own forms of government and worship, we can relate ourselves definitely and consciously to the church of America as a whole and so to the larger Church of Christ throughout the world.

WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN.

ORTHODOX HEARTS

There is no heresy but hate:
Where hearts with loving-kindness glow
There God Himself doth clearly show.
Ah, there can be no wretched fate
Off in that world beyond this ken
To one who loves his fellowmen;
For God alone can love create,
Ay, of Himself love is a part.
Could God disown a loving heart
And bar against it heaven's gate?

In ev'ry world love is the same,
And clear as day to open eyes.
Each little flower's beauty cries
Praise to the sun from whence it came:
The least of those whose loving ways
For others light life's somber days
Reflects somewhat of Christ's bright flame,
And even now his willing feet
Are treading on the golden street—
The Book of Life enrolls his name.

—Clinton Baltzell Adams.

HOW THE FEDERAL COUNCIL CAN BEST SERVE THE CHURCHES

BY ROBERT E. SPEER, D.D.

Former President Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America; Secretary Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., New York

The Federal Council of the Churches is essentially nothing but the servant of the denominations that called it into being. It has no life but a derived life, no authority but a delegated authority. This life and authority the constituent denominations could withdraw just as by their action it was bestowed. It was created to minister to their collective wants, to serve their common needs. The principle which ought to control the Federal Council is the principle of non-boastful, un-selfseeking service.

The Federal Council can best minister to the churches if the churches themselves are ready to meet a few clear and simple conditions.

In the first place, *if the Federal Council is to render that help to the churches which they need and which it ought to render, the denominations themselves must discern more clearly than they do just what is the business of the Church, what its duties are and what its problems.* There is a great deal of confusion in our churches as to what the Church is, what it ought to be and ought to do, and that confusion needs to be clarified.

The churches would themselves be vastly stronger and more effective, and could use far more fruitfully and powerfully their common agency in this Council, if they could come to some clearer common conception of their real duties and their true interests and their most vital problems, and if they could discern—as they surely would in case they reached those clearer conceptions—how large is the measure of their unity in these things, how kindred and similar they already are in their char-

acter and work, and how fully prepared for and desperately in need of a collective agency through which to express the unity of spirit and purpose and activity and duty which already exist.

What is the fundamental business of the Church? Is it not twofold, a testimony and a task? We do not see clearly enough either the character of this testimony or the nature of the task. The testimony embraces metaphysics, ethics, history, and experience—all of these. It is amazingly rich; no wonder it takes diverse forms with different bodies of us. It is to be delivered both by teaching and by life; no wonder it is only inadequately uttered by any of us. But the really wonderful thing is the measure of similarity and unity which all our versions of the testimony reveal. Looked at from outside, from the non-Christian religions, or from the philosophies which reject the Christian revelation at home, our evangelical churches seem to be marked by a unity so thorough that it is difficult to authenticate its divisions to such an external view. We have already, in the common body of our testimony, a base of unity deep and broad, which makes possible and necessary a larger measure of common use than we have thus far made of our common instrument in the Federal Council.

And what is the task of the Church? Here there sometimes appear to be wide variances. Some regard nothing human as alien to the proper function of the Church. They would carry the Church into any field or bring any element of human life and action into the Church. Others hold a theory of the spirituality of the Church which would keep it separate from the State and from the grapple of economic and social questions. But even the churches which take this view in its fullest measure perform marriage ceremonies for the State, enter the field of education, and provide for social fellowship. Here are three as fundamental recognitions as could well be conceived of the task of the Church to deal with life. The only remaining question is one not of principle but of expediency and degree. As in the matter of testimony, so also with regard to task, our evangelical churches have already a far larger community of view than they have acted upon. If they will realize this they

will serve themselves through this Counil in new and richer ways.

Progress in the reunion of denominational families would be of great help. We have been passing in some of our denominations through a very interesting experience analogous to that which confronts us in our interdenominational agencies. Agencies of this, that, and the other denomination had grown so numerous that some of our denominations, inside themselves, had become hopelessly confused and set about to work out the simplification of their own organization. Some of the bodies which have done this are amazed at the results. If in like manner we could only bring our great Christian Protestant communions into half a dozen homogeneous bodies, it would present us in this field of action with a new and simplified situation which would multiply our power many-fold and make our collective action more easy, more extensive, and more effective.

In the second place, in order that the Federal Council may better serve the churches, it is desirable that the churches should cultivate and cherish a sense of ownership over the Council. The Council is not something which the churches set up to become an agency independent of them, acting by its own authority. It was set up as a tool belonging to and to be directed by the churches which created it. I know that it is difficult to secure the fact of such control by the churches and even more difficult to assure the feeling of the churches that they are exercising such control. This is due in part to the huge size of our country. Democracy can function here only representatively, and just now democracy wants to exercise direct action and is reluctant to trust representatives or to feel that it is acting at all if it acts representatively. There is a great deal that is wholesome in this mood. Nevertheless, representative action is simply unavoidable and our problem is how to govern the Federal Council by denominational representatives and, at the same time, have the denominations feel honestly that they are really directing the Council, and determining what it shall say and what it shall not say, what it shall do and what it shall not do.

Of course the trouble is within the denominations themselves. Each one of them has almost as many elements in it as there are different denominations in the Federal Council and no one man or small group of men can adequately and completely satisfy the full denominational consciousness. The only possible corrective here is a fuller practice of Christianity among us, a fuller unselfishness and wisdom on the part of denominational representatives, and a fuller measure of brotherly confidence and trust.

In the third place, the denominations should actually utilize the Federal Council for their collective tasks and for the new common duties which arise, instead of leaving these to individual, independent undenominational agencies. These have their place. Often something needs to be done involving more risk or a more advanced action than the whole body of any one denomination, still less the great body of all the denominations, is prepared to take. Of course we might reproach the leadership of the denominational or of the interdenominational agencies for not choosing the path of radical advance, but they are no doubt wise and right in their policy of trying to hold the whole body together for the maximum of collective action, even though this means slower progress than the bolder spirits desire. But apart from this, the simple fact is that again and again tasks have come to the churches about which there was and could be no question at all as to their common mind, and yet the churches have had no agency with which to attend to them, with the result that they have been done by other organizations and the churches have seemed to be, and have often been accused of being, remiss and ineffective in consequence.

It has occasionally been said that the Federal Council has seemed to take up tasks in the Church's name and to boast of having done them. Boasting is bad or St. Paul would not have apologized for it, but if there has been error of this sort it has been due, I imagine, simply to the jealousy of the Council for the good name of the churches and to its anxiety that those things should be done in the Church's name which ought to be so done and not be left to be done by others in their own name. Work of this sort, which must be done and which is

the legitimate work of the churches, and which it is wrong and remiss for the churches not to do as churches, is sure to increase. The churches require an agency like the Council for this work. Let them realize it.

This means a responsibility for the financial support of the Federal Council. The Council does not have a very large budget. Three hundred thousand dollars is all that is needed to do effectively the work of the Council now. In a little while it will need $500,000 and then $1,000,000. When our churches come to realize what their collective responsibilities are, this will seem a very insignificant thing. It is a very modest request which is made at present and which increasingly the churches must officially care for as part of their own work.

And now, the last and most important thing. In order that the programme of the churches through the Council may be realized and that it may serve the churches as they ought to be served, there must be more of a spirit of trust among us, inside every denomination and between denominations. There must be more of a spirit of personal, denominational, and interdenominational trust. We have to quit this business of partisanship, to quit calling each other by factional names. St. Paul would have none of these names or parties—not even a "Christian" party in the Corinthian Church. There was one Church and one foundation for that Church and no man could prescribe any other, and that foundation is Jesus Christ our Lord.

The truth of God is greater than any one party can claim or any one title but Christian can cover. What we need is the New Testament conception of its fulness and of its communicability to the whole body alone. Only the whole body of Christ is competent to know and experience the whole faith of Christ. This was St. Paul's view—"that we may be able to apprehend with *all* saints"; "till we all come in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the fulness of the stature of Christ." Let us desist from the labels and the epithets and be open to the full truth which as yet we all know, as Paul says, only in part. And which we shall know fully only as we all join together and are comprehended by the Spirit in the unity of the Body of Christ.

This is the last need of which I would speak, the need of a comprehension of all in the truth. This is not a compromise of the truth. It is partisanship and contention which compromise it. We are preaching peace to the nations. Let us make that preaching effective by winning a fuller peace ourselves in a fuller unity of faith and life in our one Divine Lord and Saviour. For my part I want no label but Christian and mean to try to call no brother Christian by any other name.

If the churches desire, as they surely need, a more effective common service and fulfilment of common duty, this is the essential thing: "Let brotherly love control. Let brotherly love control!"

ROBERT E. SPEER.

THE SACRAMENT OF LOVE

Love is the sacrament of sacraments;
For God is Love, and Love is God.
Who loves knows Him and in Him all the heights
And depths of these high rapturous delights
Which for love's soul are very soul of life,
And through the troubled ways,—through stress and strife,
Bear the soul upward to that final goal
Where life and love make one full-rounded whole.

Love tints the grayest life with rose;
Love kindles fires 'mid winter snows.
Love draws the fallen from his sin;
Love helps the sinner grace to win.
Love lifts the fringes of the night;
Love gifts the eyes of Faith with sight.
Love to all loveliness is kin;
Love moulds all Life,—without,—within.
Love is the mightiest power on earth;
Love to eternal hope gives birth.
Love—the beginning and the end—
All life and death doth comprehend.
Love lived in death upon the tree;
Love lives again, for you and me.
Love through eternity endures
For God is Love.
And Love is God.
Thank God for Love—his first, then yours.

—John Oxenham.

CHURCH FEDERATION A NECESSITY

BY REV. EDWARD TALLMADGE ROOT
Executive Secretary Massachusetts Federation of Churches, Boston, Mass.

Parish and denominational organizations are recognized necessities. A federation of churches has so far been regarded as a luxury. Christian work depends on voluntary consecration of time and money. These are limited, while the tasks of Christianizing the world are endless. The Church has nothing to waste on organizations that do not increase efficiency. Church federation will not be generally adopted unless it can be proved to be necessary for the success of the full programme of the Church.

I.

Church Federation is Necessary to Christianize Individuals

The saving of souls is an accepted task. It is assumed that churches and denominations working separately, stimulated by rivalry, are succeeding here at least.

Large results are admitted. But Paul has correctly defined our aim: "To present *every* man perfect in Christ." Though ninety and nine were in the fold, the Good Shepherd seeks the one that is lost. And the fact is that the churches, working independently, fail to reach, know, or even care whether they reach, the whole population. If they are successful as institutions, well supported, well attended, apparently growing, they are not much concerned about the sheep without a shepherd, exposed to all the increasing temptations of modern life with little moral instruction or religious inspiration. It is true that they try "to reach the masses." But the methods which they use, "attractions," popular preaching, advertising, visitation, make them rivals. *Until they intentionally co-operate, they inevitably compete.* Once denominational zeal stimulated

such competition. Now the Christian conscience shrinks from it; and to avoid it most churches confine their aggressive effort to a limited circle. Beyond these narrow circles lie multitudes of neglected. Even if one church tries to reach them, the number is beyond its resources, and its invitation in most cases is baffled by latent preference for some other type of faith or worship.

By co-operation, on the contrary, it is possible for the churches to know every individual in every family as thoroughly as they now know their own membership lists. Knowledge is power. Power over men is gained only by knowledge of men. When the churches have facts recorded about every family, they can touch every family in one of three ways—by meeting the supreme need for God, by helping in lower needs, or by enlisting in service for community needs. This is no mere theory. Thrilling illustrations in both rural towns and great cities could be cited.

This obligation to reach the whole population has from the beginning been recognized as the primary reason for interdenominational co-operation. It was one of the objectives of the Evangelical Alliance and the Sunday School Association. The co-operative-parish plan of the Free Church Councils of England was imitated by the earliest Federations in America—in New York City and Providence. It has been overshadowed by other lines of effort. The churches that attempted it have grown weary of the persistent effort required, and disappointed because those who have to be looked up are not ready recruits. Yet its ideal persists and is revived. Those who have grasped its theory and steadfastly practiced and urged it say, with Rev. Raymond Calkins, D.D., after experience in two cities, "It is the only thorough and systematic way of doing church work." Some day the churches will see this and make the persistent effort required for success. This task alone necessitates church federation.

If, again, the churches are adequately to utilize the power of the printed page and appeal to "Eye-gate," they must act together. Expensive on a small scale, the products of the printing press become cheap in proportion to the magnitude of their

use. It would pay to diminish the number of preachers to small congregations and put the money saved into skillful proclamation of the Gospel in newspapers and by the wayside. The same is true of that newer miracle, the radio. The churches are evidently unable to utilize these modern agencies except co-operatively. The results already achieved in many cities are only the first fruits of a mighty harvest.

Co-operative pastoral evangelism is giving new power to that traditional reliance of the churches. The results in cities like Indianapolis or Cleveland surpass the achievements of the best professional evangelists, and unlike their strenuous campaigns, the plan can be repeated year after year with cumulative results. Thus even in reaching the individual, church federation is a demonstrated necessity.

II.

Church Federation is Necessary to Christianize the Social Order

That this is a part of the task of the churches is still denied by some church people. It is assumed by the general public, as the current criticisms prove. The churches are always criticized for not doing things. If anything is wrong, from a local strike to a world war, people say: "There! you see the churches have failed." In Christian circles now there is a growing conviction that the mission of the church means nothing less than the establishment of the Kingdom of God, the fulfilment of its daily prayer: "Thy will be done on earth."

The moment the churches seriously face this task in community or continent, they find themselves powerless acting separately. "When the devil sees the Baptist finger, the Congregational finger, the Methodist finger, the Presbyterian finger, or the Episcopal thumb coming at him," said the late Dean George Hodges, "the devil smiles." Only as they clench into a fist or grasp as a hand, can the fingers do anything. "We ministers," confessed a prominent pastor in a conspicuously church-going city, "do the petty things. The big tasks we all neglect."

Why? Obviously because they are beyond the power of any parish or denomination.

In thirty brief years interchurch councils have demonstrated that they can and do give a new grasp and power in all social problems. This may be illustrated in four spheres of influence—the community, the commonwealth, the nation, and the world.

1. *In the Community*

Churches must be organized on community lines. That organization, too, must be elastic to fit all conditions. In communities too small for more than one well-equipped place of worship, church federation will mean removal of duplication by "exchange of fields," "federated" or "union" churches. No phase of the movement has produced more striking results or evoked heartier approval. Where population or distances require several congregations, groups of churches too small to pay for leadership or clerical service, relying on the voluntary efforts of pastors or laymen, have scored brilliant and permanent achievements. The achievements of such "self-directed federations" have been too little recognized in the chorus of praise given to the few great city federations. But that praise is justified. The New York Federation by its pioneer demonstrations made name and new method a reality. In such cities as Cleveland, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, and Chicago, the whole situation has been changed by a Christianity united and aggressive.

Without such organization, in any community large or small, the churches can neither know nor meet the real needs. The "survey" is the basis of achievement. Knowledge of the facts everywhere reveals endless tasks in the suppression of evil and revision for individual and social needs. Race-relations, recreation, religious education, city-planning, and church attendance, finances, and membership—all receive a new stimulus. "Who is sufficient for these things?" The churches, strongest of all voluntary organizations, both in membership, financial resources, moral character, and spiritual motives, if federated, "can do all things through Christ who strengtheneth them."

2. *In the State*

The American State is the basis of our system of government. The states constitute the nation and create and regulate their own municipalities. Despite constant commerce and exchange of population, they preserve characteristic psychology and provincial pride and patriotism. With few exceptions, denominations are organized upon state lines. Obviously the churches must be organized to influence these sources of law, and to give their action significance through delegates appointed by the ecclesiastical bodies. A state federation alone can cover the whole field of interchurch co-operation, territorially or practically. Confined to the cities, we have federation only in spots. The movement must touch and include the most isolated hamlet and congregation, and enrich farm life as well as factory and tenement. Moreover some agency—and what one is better than the churches co-operating?—must hold together city and country, manufacturing, commercial, and educational communities, unacquainted if not mutually jealous, and give reality to that prophetic term which the Pilgrims brought—*The Commonwealth!*

Of course, a state federation should promote local combinations and councils, and do its best work in bettering theirs. But on moral issues, increasingly submitted to the voters, and in concerted action necessary in such lines as evangelism and church attendance, if our vast shifting population is to be really Christianized, a state-wide organization alone can suffice. In states like California, Massachusetts, and pre-eminently Ohio, the possibilities have been demonstrated.

3. *In the Nation*

All which we have said about the state is supremely true of the nation, the mountain peak of power and dignity, the fountain-head of law and order. The churches must be organized nationally or their greatest tasks are beyond their reach. Only a nation-wide evangelism and religious education can avail in a country like ours. Knit together into one industrial organism, its social problems are so complicated and inter-

related that only the conscience of the whole church can solve them. In foreign relations, the nation acts as one; if these are ever to be Christianized, all its men of good-will must be able to speak and act together.

The very statement of the needs is a description and eulogy of the work of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America during the less than two decades of its existence. It has given Protestantism a common voice and an influence commensurate with its strength. Its aid in a sane, concerted, and constant evangelism is building up the churches. It spoke on the twelve-hour day, jointly with Roman Catholics and Jews; and to the religious forces of America the steel-trust yielded. It mobilized the Christian pens of the nation; thirteen and one-half million letters poured in upon the State Department, and the Washington Conference on Naval Disarmament began with a world-startling proposal and ended in the agreement of the great Powers. Never in history has the church of any nation, though established and undivided, acted with such freedom, courage, idealism, and effectiveness, as have the churches of the United States through their Council during the last decade! Greater crises are before them, and the work of the Council has only begun.

Such a national federation has necessarily stimulated co-operation locally and internationally. It systematically promotes councils of churches, state and local, and brings their salaried executives together for interchange of experience and inspiration. The World War brought it into sympathetic and helpful relations with sister churches in the allied nations; and it was the first to stretch hands across the bloody chasm in fellowship and aid to brethren in all Europe. Imitation is the sincerest tribute. At the Quadrennial Meeting in Boston, in 1920, the councils or interdenominational bodies of twenty other nations sent greetings through their representatives. Thus it has prepared the way for

4. *Federation Embracing the World*

Is not this also a necessity? The world henceforth is one for weal or woe. Distance no longer divides. The oceans are

highways. The radio girdles the earth in a second. There are now no foreign nations. Commerce, science, art, and literature know no boundaries of frontier or language. Modern science makes the healing of the nations one problem. Missions have broken down denominational narrowness, brought Christianity face to face with other faiths, and made religion a question not only of the individual but of mankind.

The churches, therefore, must be organized ecumenically. Confined to one land or race, they cannot attain full-orbed Christianity. The full meaning of the teachings of Christ will never be realized until the practical Chinese begin to live them, and the mystical Hindus interpret them. Each nation and denomination must be free to follow its own leading of the Spirit. Co-operation in common tasks will bring fellowship and efficiency in the world as a community.

Those tasks are the same, magnified. That the labour problems of the world are one has already been recognized at Geneva. All governments consult to eradicate the abuse of narcotics. And when we contemplate the abolition of the supreme danger and crime of humanity, war, it is obvious that only as all the nations beat their swords into plowshares can any be safe. A league of nations may devise a court of international justice, secure mutual agreement to use it, and propose concerted disarmament. All this is but the body. The churches must supply the soul. They alone can secure mental disarmament, and bring to bear the very motives of eternity. And how can they gain "that force which comes from frequent discussion and consequent united opinion," unless they meet in council, and establish some form of continuation? The Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work, held in Stockholm, Sweden, last August, resulted in a great stimulus to the consciousness of need of international co-operation.

III.

Church Federation is Necessary to Secure Christian Reunion

What is the relation of church federation, thus developing and succeeding, to the organic reunion of Christendom? It is

not hostile. It will not hinder, it will help. The greatest hindrance to unity is the aloofness of the sects. Their leaders do not know, and hence distrust each other. Nothing better promotes mutual acquaintance than labour side by side in a common task. "True," says one, "but my Church cannot recognize other Christian bodies as churches. Therefore, my formula during this period of division is: 'The maximum co-operation of Christian *individuals.*'" This is what we have had for a century; and if it continues, and all worth-while Christian work is done by individuals apart from the existing ecclesiastical bodies, will these, when they are ready to unite, retain enough prestige and significance to make reunion worth while? Federation seeks to preserve and strengthen those bodies, both for present efficiency and future unity. Therefore, its formula is: The maximum co-operation of existing ecclesiastical bodies, i. e., the maximum which the polity and policy of each permits. This may vary. It may seem meager. Yet the fruits of such co-operation, as we have demonstrated, are already magnificent.

Nor is church federation so very different from the picture of the reunited Church as drawn by the bishops of the Anglican communion at Lambeth in 1920. They said that there is no reason why the different "groups," Presbyterian and Congregational, should not retain their characteristic organization. As in the federation plan, all groups would be united in district and national synods. The only difference would be that all groups would elect bishops who should be consecrated by the united Church. Perhaps we are nearer to the goal than we thought. The keynote at the first "New England Congregational Congress" was: "We need more vision and supervision." If the Latin, "supervisor" is translated into Greek, it becomes *"episcopos."* Is it possible that only names now divide us? We can find out only by following in the way by which Providence is leading. Church federation is necessary because it is the only possible road to unity.

EDWARD TALLMADGE ROOT.

THE GROWTH OF AMERICAN CHURCH FEDERATION

BY S. PARKES CADMAN, D.D.

President Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America; Pastor of Central Congregational Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.

THE religious life of the United States has developed in two main directions. Its earlier expression, once the colonizing period had passed, was based upon the principle of absolute freedom in all matters relative to faith and order. Puritan and Anglican, Friend and Roman Catholic, Moravian and evangelical, were at liberty to take possession of a continental area by every legitimate means of religious propaganda. This principle produced the one hundred and fifty denominations and churches which flourish with varying degrees of vitality in the United States. Their differences, which are frequently more superficial than determinative, have not weakened our belief in freedom. But they have led to some serious reflections about its wise use in the religious history of the nation.

The second direction of America's institutional religion is based upon the principle of fraternal intercourse between the Protestant groups. Their disorganized condition had rendered them comparatively inoperative in grave national emergencies. The moralizing influence of religious life upon the exigencies of politics was largely weakened by confusion of agencies to that end. In instances that could be quoted the churches became the helots of the State, and patriotism supplanted the higher loyalty which the Christian owes to the will of God alone. Averse as American Protestants are to elaborate ecclesiastical systems, because these, as they contend, entail the loss of valuable individual rights and stultify intellectual and spiritual growth by the pressure of officialdom and routine, they were, nevertheless, compelled to find an ampler outlet for their energies upon mat-

ters concerning the Kingdom of our common Lord, and, also, the interests of the race for which He died.

To advertise peculiarities of belief or practice and suppress the profound agreements which unite Christians of every shade of opinion, is a disastrous policy. It is now the settled view of our church leaders that Protestantism will not be predominantly Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist, or Congregational in its future developments. But they have little doubt that it can, if it will, be predominantly Christian, and thus win a wider hearing and obtain a popular response impossible to any one of its sectarian forms. These forms are not censurable; on the contrary, they have had honoured records, and bequeathed inspiring memories. Yet the resistless trend toward the solidification of society accentuated the overtures which arose spontaneously for a more united front against the recognized evils which arrest human progress.

A further and very provocative cause for federation was the surrender of public education to secular rule. Since upon nothing else do people differ so strongly as upon religious issues, the constitutional law of the United States rightly provides that such differences shall be avoided by the political management of public instruction. The assimilating force of the public schools, the self-denying labours of their teachers and managers, and the splendid results they have achieved are familiar to every student of American affairs. But an educational scheme which necessarily excludes definite religious teaching will always be unsatisfactory to multitudes of Americans who are alive to the fact that their Republic owes its existence in a large measure to spiritual principles, expressed in salutary political action.

Plainly, any steps toward co-ordinated service had to be both tentative and comprehensive. We have a justifiable pride in the state our fathers ordained, but this pride is too often provincial. It is a pride not always regulated by the historic consciousness of the Church Universal as the creator of great nations and the mother of that obedience, which is the first condition of civilized society. Nor is it to be marveled at that millions of Americans have found vent for their devotion either

in sectarian tenets or in the Bible as the authorizing source of those tenets. I suspect that in these traits they resemble the rest of their brethren elsewhere. That the Church, under God, gave us the Bible, and that the irremovable center of faith for disrupted Protestantism throughout the world is neither a creed nor a book, but a Person and a Life, are cardinal truths still foreign to the consciousness of too many excellent Christians both in Europe and America.

It has been the task of American Christian statesmanship to divert these pure and lofty attachments to their proper channels. In so doing there is no desire to interfere in any way with the doctrines and policies of constituent churches. Far otherwise; mobilization, not absorption, is the standing order of federation. It is the more secure and operative because it combines the reverence of the Anglican, the ardour of the Methodist, the intellectual integrity of the Presbyterian, the instinctive freedom of the Congregationalist and the Baptist, and the tranquility of the Moravian and the Friend.

As a distinct organization the Federal Council of Churches dates from the year 1908, when it embodied in itself several previous attempts of a kindred nature. To-day it includes twenty-eight communions with an approximate membership of twenty million souls and fifty million adherents. Its secretariat covers numerous departments of a co-operative service. Its administrative and executive committees have none save delegated rights, and are perfectly content to shine, in so far as they shine at all, in a borrowed radiance.

The Federal Council has gained the confidence of Church and nation because it presumes on no man's freedom and dictates no denominational policies. It is the instrument of the Christians who summoned it into the field. Its continued existence depends upon their consent and support. It regards the voice of the united churches as the source of its direction. It leaves theological and political controversies severely alone. Liberal and conservative are welcomed to its ranks. It finds its efficacy in the Divine word that organizations which would save their lives must first lose them for the sake of the Lord of all life, who came not to be ministered unto, but to minister,

and to give Himself as a ransom for us all. The sole hope and reward of the Council is the approval of the churches for which it lives, moves, and has its being.

What are the lessons of this fragmentary review? First, the need and the recompense of patience. He goes far who goes slow, without dreaming of retreat, and blessed is the saint who is glad of small beginnings. Let us distrust bigness; the Gospel starts as leaven in the meal, as the mustard seed, the least of all seeds, which, notwithstanding, grows to a mighty and a sheltering tree. If anyone is bemused with bigness, he can know that we have been admonished that the principle which is right, however feeble in appearance, will win in the end. Not how fast or how slow, but in what direction we move, is the issue to be kept steadily before us.

The genial co-operation of the churches should be sought, and, when found, entrusted to those men and women who hold strategic positions in the churches. Enlist the unselfish, the sacrificial, the practical people who do the actual work of God's Kingdom on the earth, who actually push forward its social and spiritual conquests. They have the will, the knowledge, and the opportunity to aid every commendable enterprise. Unify not only individuals but organizations, and never set up additional boards or agencies except as a last resort. Above all else, let us postpone oratory and proceed to action, creating contacts, dispelling prejudices, arousing sympathetic appreciation and fraternal aid.

S. Parkes Cadman.

Be strong!
We are here not to play, to dream, to drift,
We have hard work to do and loads to lift.
Shun not the struggle, face it. 'Tis God's gift.

Be strong!
It matters not how deep entrenched the wrong,
How hard the battle goes, the day how long.
Faint not, fight on! To-morrow comes the song.

—*Maltbie D. Babcock.*

THE PRESENT STATUS OF LOCAL FEDERATION

BY ROY B. GUILD, D. D.
Minister Trinitarian Congregational Church, New Bedford, Mass.

THE movement toward church unity is developing rapidly in two fields—in the local community and in the Church as a whole. And each development is indispensable to the other. In the last analysis, however, everything rests upon the local church.

The increasing co-operation of churches in efforts to Christianize the community in which they are located means the harmonizing of purposes, the co-ordinating of plans, the synchronizing of efforts, in order to render a common service more effectively. It is the unity in deeds that is immediately possible and universally needed.

The name earlier given to the organization by which this co-operation has been made possible is the federation of churches. A more common name to-day is the council of churches. As the genius of the federation movement is local autonomy, no group rules for others on this or any other matter. The churches of the community which create the organization are the sole authority in determining form, personnel, programme, and name.

At the close of the World War there was a most noticeable change in the progress of the federation movement. In the year 1919 the growth was more rapid and more substantial than in all the preceding four years or in any four years prior to the war. City after city swung into line, creating local councils with executive leadership, largely as a result of assistance given by the Federal Council's Commission on Councils of Churches (State and Local). There are now more than forty cities with such interchurch bodies. Many other communities have councils depending on volunteer leadership.

It is no longer a question of whether the churches will form a council—it is only a question of when. Every community that does not have it is in need of it; nearly every community is ready for it. All that is lacking is a nucleus about which opinion and desire and action may crystallize, and crystallization in permanent organization follows inevitably where there is strong local initiative.

The steady growth in the co-operation of local churches has been in accordance with a simple principle: any community having two or more churches cannot adequately provide for its religious needs, unless there is some committee, council, federation, or other organization through which the churches can function together.

The development of plans in accordance with this principle has been gradual. It has not been due to any particular person or organization. In the beginning it was spontaneous. A few individuals, members of various churches, undertook to meet some community need which challenged those who professed a desire to see the Kingdom of God established on the earth. Out of these united efforts came such institutions as the International Sunday School Association, the Young Men's Christian Association, the Young Women's Christian Association, the Women's Christian Temperance Union, the Anti-Saloon League, and many other kindred organizations. Their inception and growth were due to the desire of Christians to do certain things which were not being done, and which could not be done by individuals or by groups of individuals acting separately. The organization of ministerial unions and associations was due to this same desire. In addition to discussing subjects of mutual interest to clergymen, they often grappled with community conditions demanding the attention of the churches. Aside from having union meetings and union evangelistic campaigns, the bond of interest was most often the fight against the liquor traffic and its attendant evils.

The next natural step was for the churches *as churches* to undertake to attend to these matters. Committees were formed whose members were appointed by the churches. The life of such committees was generally brief. The churches gained an

unenviable reputation for having spasms of evangelistic and reforming fervour. The important fact is that in putting forth these efforts the churches learned the value of co-operation and learned how to co-operate. Church members were coming to realize that they must have a part in making plans and carrying them out as church members, instead of being compelled to find an outlet for interest and energies in other enterprises for which the churches as churches were not responsible.

A study of past experience reveals the fact that in large communities the success of the work depends very much upon having an employed leadership. In cities where a secretary had been in charge of a central office, the co-operation of the churches had become permanent and increasingly effective. These cities, and, in like manner, the states that had adopted this policy, were the laboratories in which the principles and methods which gave greatest promise of success were thoroughly worked out. Cleveland, Cincinnati, St. Louis, Indianapolis, Atlanta, Louisville, Sacramento, Pittsburgh, and other cities had passed through various experiences. Other cities had met with good success though depending on volunteer service, such as Hartford, Los Angeles, and Milwaukee. Too much credit cannot be given to the men who in all these cities and in the states of California and Massachusetts were the pioneers in this movement.

The principles which they found to be fundamental and the plans and methods which they proved to be workable constitute the solid foundation on which this practice of Christian unity rests to-day. In this field we have passed from the days of experiment to the days of continuous achievement. To state some of the guiding principles is to define and to describe this movement.

(*a*) The first principle, which is basic, is a definition.

"By a council or federation of churches is meant the churches themselves as churches, consulting and co-operating officially, through accredited delegates, for all accepted common tasks." No association of individuals, or of organizations of individuals, or of separate departments in the churches, or of representative church members not accredited, constitutes a

council or federation of churches. The churches differ, of course, in the methods by which delegates are accredited to such a council, according to the practices or rules of each denomination.

(*b*) The churches, independent and differing in policy, ritual, and creeds, cannot recognize in the organization, or in the combined membership of a council, any superior ecclesiastical authority. Membership involves only the maximum co-operation which the principles, policy, and polity of each communion permit. The only force possible in such a council, and the only force necessary to secure practical results, is "that force which comes from frequent discussion and consequent united opinion." The council has no authority to assess the participating churches. The acceptance of financial responsibilities rests with the church that joins.

(*c*) A council of churches is not another outside organization, but a clearing-house of the churches where they consult together and then work in co-operation on common tasks. One of the most common descriptions of a federation is that it is to the religious life of the community what the chamber of commerce is to the business life of a community.

(*d*) Specific tasks may furnish the occasion for the organization of a council of churches, but they do not constitute its limits, end, or significance. That significance lies in the fact that a council of churches reveals and makes effectual the unity of the churches as the great Church of Christ, so far as such unity is possible under our present denominational organization.

(*e*) A council or federation of churches is an autonomous body. It has no external official relationships with other councils—local, state, or national. The churches in the community determine the character of the organization and the programme of work, provide for all funds, and direct the expenditure of the same. All fellowship with other councils is voluntary. It is strictly a home rule proposition, yet through fraternal relations it has the benefit of the experiences and even the services of kindred organizations.

The acid test of an institution is, what does it accomplish? It is not always possible to see the results; sometimes they can be felt but not seen. The results of church co-operation through permanent interchurch organizations are discernible both by the sense of feeling and the sense of sight. In city after city the testimony is that the council of churches creates an atmosphere in which those who refer to the whole community, especially those whose ways are ways of darkness, speak more frequently of the Church and less frequently of the churches.

Before the Baltimore Federation of Churches was formed a group of interested laymen and clergymen believed much could be done by the churches for the good of Baltimore which was not being done, but they wished a definite statement based on actual programmes tested in other cities. The failure of an early effort to do federated work had made them dubious of future success. War-time responsibilities, however, had brought them together and they were willing to go on together, provided worth-while tasks could be performed. The one question had to be answered, "What can the churches do together?" Or, as one layman put it, "How can an executive secretary earn his salary?" The mental attitude of Baltimore is the usual attitude of other cities at that stage in the development. The concise statement of a suggested programme for that city has served in a dozen other cities and will probably serve in a hundred more, as it is an epitome of successful undertakings for nearly a decade in a gradually increasing number of communities. It declares that the federation exists to fulfil the following functions:

(*a*) To make a continuous religious survey, to furnish reliable information and a basis for intelligent action.

(*b*) To prevent unnecessary overlapping and competition between the denominations, and to see that all communities are adequately churched.

(*c*) To endeavour to arrest the attention of the city with the claims of Christ through a strategic programme of evangelism in the churches individually, and unitedly where possible, depending almost entirely on local leaders.

(*d*) To study the great outstanding industrial and social needs of the city, and to apply Christianity in an effort at solution.

(*e*) To effect a policy of recreation which will afford to all the people as much as, or more than, the saloon has given, and to make all the recreations wholesome and uplifting.

(*f*) To present a programme of Christian education that will meet the needs of the city.

(*g*) To interpret Christian democracy, especially to the alien, non-English speaking groups in the city.

(*h*) To give proper publicity to Christianity, to the churches, and the religious interests of the city.

(*i*) To make religion effective and attractive in the city, and to apply to the work of the churches the best modern business principles of efficiency and economy.

The churches have generally been brought together because of the desire to rectify some civic or social condition that was a detriment to the community, or to make more effective the evangelistic work of the churches. The single effort to deal with one or the other of these problems very quickly leads out into other avenues of service. Sometimes two or more groups have been organized to do different types of work. The multiplying of the groups results in confusion. Some councils and federations resulted from the bringing of these groups into one organization. This was noticeably the case in Pittsburgh. Two very strong bodies had developed from committees composed of clergymen and laymen appointed by the Union Ministerial Association. The Council of the Churches of Christ in Pittsburgh was organized to relate these lines of work more closely, to give them more substantial backing, and to have an organization which could deal with other problems which were of common concern to all the churches. A prominent clergyman moved from Indianapolis, where the Council had been operating for five years, to Portland, Oregon. He explained his determination to have a council in Portland by saying, "Every time we wish to do anything together we have to discuss it at length in the ministers' meeting, then we appoint the committee, work out our plans, do the work, throw away the machinery we have

constructed, and start all over the next time. In Indianapolis we had an organization that included all the elements in the churches, not just the ministers. We had responsible committees to attend to different matters. Now I have to give so much time to all sorts of committees that as a matter of self-protection to preachers and churches we must federate."

The fact that bad social conditions were often the factor that aroused the churches to a sense of their need of united action led many to regard the federation movement as a social reform movement. The dominant feature of the movement today, however, is the evangelistic. One of the greatest services rendered by the federation movement has been the development of the city-wide, simultaneous, pastoral evangelistic campaign. This is coming to be the universally accepted method, having been tested year after year in a number of cities. By this means also the churches are becoming trained to work together, under central leadership, in religious education and in campaigns for civic and social righteousness.

ROY B. GUILD.

WANDERERS

Our feet have wandered from thy path,
  Thou lowly Christ of Galilee,
Sweet prophet of the helping hand,
  Meek Lord of love and sympathy.

Thy faith was but to walk with God
  With humble heart and open mind
But we have builded shrines of stone
  In which to worship—spirit-blind!

We lift our heads in loveless prayers,
  We glory in our well-wrought creed,
Though righteousness alone avails,
  Though mercy is the only need.

Break down, O Christ, our heartless faiths,
  And give to us that spirit fine
Which feels in Thee a Comrade strong,
  In every soul a friend of Thine.

—*Thomas Curtis Clark.*

A LAYMAN'S VIEW OF CHRISTIAN SERVICE THROUGH CO-OPERATION

BY THE HON. THEODORE CHRISTIANSON
Governor of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.

We have not reached the millenium yet; we have not banished war and hate, poverty and pride, greed and envy, indifference and intolerance. But after nineteen hundred years of Christianity, we have broken down some of the barriers between the classes; and most of the walls that separate men now have doors in them. The doctrine of a universal brotherhood and a common humanity has not yet borne all of its fruits; but men have learned to tolerate each other even when they cannot obey the injunction to love one another. The spirit of democracy which inhered in the life as well as the teachings of the Man of Nazareth is dissolving the arbitrary divisions and distinctions of humanity, and is bringing men nearer to an acceptance of the ancient truth that "God hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on the face of the whole earth."

The glory of Christianity is that it places a high value on the individual. It recognizes the development of the individual character as paramount. It seeks to promote in every man the desire and aspiration to grow to the full measure of his spiritual capacity. But it would be a futile practice to place a high value on our fellow man, if we did not couple that practice with an effort to improve his condition and enlarge his happiness. There are economic maladjustments to be corrected, there are industrial wrongs to be righted, there are political reforms that need to be carried on. The problem of poverty, with its attendant evil of crime, needs to be attacked. Who is better qualified to carry on the battle against wrong and injustice than the members of the Church, the soldiers of the spiritual Kingdom? Does not the challenge call for the men of the

churches boldly to attack every community problem, to take a hand in every community task?

Christianity must furnish the mind and heart and conscience of every movement which looks toward a better world. The paramount duty of the men in the churches to-day is to do those things that may promote a better understanding, a larger sympathy, a more cordial outlook, a better realization of fellowship, among men.

Too often the men of the churches have assumed that their obligations to society were met by acts of charity, by giving alms. However laudable such generosity may be, it serves a human purpose only imperfectly. Alms are but bandages on the wounds of the social body. It is commendable to provide bandages, but it is better to prevent wounds; it is well to alleviate poverty, but it is admirable to do something to prevent it.

If the love which is inherent in Christianity could be translated into terms of justice, fair-dealing, co-operation, fellowship, in all our relations, it would furnish the basis and inspiration for the solution of all our social problems.

A movement such as the Council of Churches represents should help to do this by removing the consciousness of class distinction. This organization enables the men of the churches, regardless of creed, nationality, financial condition, intellectual endowments, and social status, to meet on common ground. I have enough faith in humanity to believe that if men can be brought together, they cannot only be made to understand each other, but to sympathize with and help each other. There is no problem that cannot be solved when men lose themselves in zeal for the promotion of the common good.

This organization gives opportunity for the forces of righteousness in this community to act together. When the Church has failed in the past, it has failed not so much because it did not have the vision of service as because it did not have the means of co-ordinating the efforts of one church body with those of another. In truth, denominations have too often spent so much effort in competing with one another, and even in opposing each other, that they have not had sufficient reserves of

strength left to do much to advance the cause of the spiritual Kingdom. This organization does not contemplate the elimination of difference in creed. It is probably well that there are differences in statements of faith and forms of worship. Those differences lend colour and stimulate interest. A Christianity in which all churches placed the emphasis on the same doctrinal points and interpreted all truths in the same way would be like a garden in which not only all the flowers were roses, but all roses were of the same shade of red. The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ contemplates that, despite differences of creed and form, despite differences of tradition and interpretation, it shall act as one army in the battle against wrong and indecency and injustice, whenever they appear, in opposition to the things which militate against a clean and wholesome community life.

The greatest need of the world today is religion—not so much religion in the Church as religion in the places where the battles of life are fought. We have been trying to keep humanity from destroying itself by enacting more laws and hiring more policemen, and we have failed. We know that, although laws may indicate that reform is being accomplished, law of itself does not bring about reform. Religion must come to the rescue; religion which is the spring from which flow righteousness, justice, and well-doing. One Church will do more to save the social fabric than a hundred jails; one sermon will accomplish more than a thousand laws, if the message of that sermon is carried out of the Church into the world by men and women who seek faithfully and earnestly to live up to it.

THEODORE CHRISTIANSON.

MEMBERS OF CHRIST'S BODY

BY GEORGE C. PIDGEON, D. D.
Moderator of the United Church of Canada, Toronto, Canada

THE Church, which is his Body, the fulness of Him who all in all is being fulfilled. Ephesians 1:22, 23. (Armitage Robinson's Translation)

The key-thought of the Epistle to the Ephesians is: Our membership in the Body of Christ means that we are members of one another. Some one remarked lately that there is "no short-circuiting" in Paul's thinking; he knew humanity too well to imagine that the chasms between the different sections of the race can be bridged by direct influence or appeal; only through Christ can men be really joined together. If we are in Him, we are by that fact vitally united with each other. Paul's great illustration is that of the head and the members of the body. It seems to me that in this epistle Paul thinks of Christ as the central self. It is his vital energy by which we live. In the acorn is the oak life; by the action of the sun and the soil its vital energies are released; when we say "it grows," we mean that the life is building up an organism which will manifest its nature and serve the purposes of its existence. In the same way, Christ is our life; it is his vital energy which builds up the members of his body. Through us He expresses Himself and works toward the ends for which He came into the world. Naturally the members of the body are one with the life which produces and sustains them, and therefore, and thereby, they are members of one another.

The courage and faith which could accept such an ideal and carry his life into it were amazing in the conditions in which Paul lived. The clefts and chasms between the different sections of humanity were far deeper and wider then than now. No gulf between the classes of society now is as terrible as that between the slave and his owner. Sheer force and nothing else

was the basis of their relationships, and to call that force brutal is a libel on the brute. Racial antagonisms were invariably unto blood. Every boundary-line was a battle-line, except where Rome crushed all alike and superseded their relations with each other by a common subjection to herself. Even then the old jealousies and animosities boiled the more fiercely because suppressed, and to beat another race into subjection was the height of a nation's ambition.

Paul found these divisions everywhere and new ones drawn wherever possible. In their city life "the sojourners were a class of residents who were recognized by law and were allowed certain definite privileges; but their very name suggested that their position was not a permanent one; they resided on sufferance only, and had no rights of citizenship." "They were unenfranchised 'outlanders'" (J. Armitage Robinson) tolerated only so long as it paid the community to do so. Even in the highest functions of the soul, the religious, barriers were erected which could never be ignored. "The middle wall of partition" was a low stone barrier above five feet in height, which no Gentile could pass on pain of death. One of the tablets warning them not to intrude was discovered in 1871, and reads as follows:

> "No man of another nation to enter within the fence and enclosure round the temple. And whoever is caught will have himself to blame that his death ensues."

Humanity is really one at heart, and these rents in the body were sore like the edges of a gaping wound. They hurt if any one tried to draw them together; they hurt still more if, as was usually the case, they were torn apart still more widely and deeply. Humanity was wounded to the heart, and Paul felt that, unless God intervened, the hurt would be unto death.

Yet in the face of that situation Paul had the daring to declare that the love of Christ could heal these wounds. In Galatians 3:28 he says: "There can be neither Jew nor Greek" —race differences submerged; "there can be neither bond nor free"—the difference between the slave and his master blotted

out; "there can be no male and female"—even the difference of sex forgotten; "ye are all one in Christ Jesus."

Later on he taught that by the grace of Christ all were brought together in a Divine society. In a sermon delivered in Toronto some time ago, Dr. Richard Roberts pointed out the two ideas in Ephesians 2: first, the Divine grace (vs. 1-10), and, second, the Divine society (vs. 11-22). These two ideas alternate throughout the Ephesians. Some men have taken hold of one of them, and some of the other, and developed them independently until in the course of history they are found in opposition. Augustine emphasized both truths, the Divine grace in his controversy with Pelagius and in his Confessions; and the Divine society in *The City of God.* The idea of harmonizing them, or, rather, of showing how vitally they are connected, never occurred to him. The Roman Church developed the idea of the Divine society at the expense of the Divine grace. The church tried to confine the Divine grace to its own channels, and in so doing put barriers between the lost soul and the grace which sought to save. The Protestant, or Evangelical, movement has stressed the Divine grace at the expense of the Divine society. They built so much on the directness of the relationships between the soul and its Saviour that they failed to see that all who are built on this foundation are necessarily built together. Hence the weakness of Protestantism has been its tendency toward division. The Church will never be right until it reaches Paul's grand conception of a Church in which both of these factors will find their due place and importance. "For in one spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether bond or free; and we are all made to drink of one spirit" (I Cor. 12:13).

It is interesting to trace the path by which Paul reached this conception. In Galatians and the controversy out of which it sprang, Paul had maintained the doctrine of the immediacy of the soul's relations with God. Jewish Christians were trying to put circumcision and observance of the law between the soul and its Saviour, and to insist on external rites as one of the conditions of salvation. Paul held that the directness of Christ's entry to the soul and his sufficiency as a Saviour, was the

corner-stone of Christianity and must be maintained no matter what the cost. He fought fiercely for this position at the Council of Jerusalem and won a complete victory. A little later, he found that the Jewish-Christian element had perverted the faith of his unsuspecting Galatian converts, and he wrote a letter to his churches in Galatia in which he tore to pieces the position of his opponents, and presented his doctrine of the immediacy of the soul's relations with God with a tempestuous fury which swept their arguments from the field. Paul had no regard for the consequences when in the heat of this struggle; if keeping the door into Christ's heart wide open to all men divided him from his Jewish-Christian brethren, he would regretfully have to accept it; the fulfilment of Christ's purpose and the salvation of men depended upon the proclamation of the free grace of God and nothing must be allowed to hold it back.

Here is a position of the first importance in the life of any church. Union with God is the first condition of spiritual life, and no price is too great to pay for it; union with men is the second condition of spiritual life and is the natural result of the first. If in the course of history the maintenance of our union with men becomes inconsistent with the maintenance of our union with God, we must sacrifice the union with men for the sake of the union with God. This is precisely what Luther did. He found the church of his day upholding doctrines and practices which separated the soul from its Saviour. At first he imagined that he had only to draw the attention of the authorities at Rome to these abuses to have them removed. But when he discovered that the church was determined to retain them, and to destroy all who opposed her policy, he renounced her, and built up Evangelical Protestantism on the basis of salvation by faith in Christ alone. John Wesley never wanted to leave the Church of England, and handicapped his own movement for decades to prevent a schism, but there is this note in his diary under date of August, 1763:

> I was more convinced than ever that the preaching like an Apostle without joining together those that are awakened and training them up in the ways of God is only begetting children for the murderer. How much preaching has there been for these twenty years all over Pembrokeshire!

but no regular societies, no discipline, no order or connection; and the consequence is that nine in ten of the once-awakened are faster asleep than ever.

He abhorred schism, but he had to form societies that his converts might live. So in many of the disruptions of the Church's history. When the Church failed to lead men to God, or put herself between them and God, those who valued the eternal things had to forsake her in order that the Gospel of salvation might be presented to men. The only way of maintaining their union wth God was to break the union with men. No church can live which ignores this fundamental condition of spiritual life. No church can bring God's message of salvation to the world unless she keeps before their minds the conditions of spiritual life and is willing to sink her own interests and claims in order to bring them directly to God.

The German poet, Schiller, once used words to this effect—that the thinkers, poets, and artists of the world could not have done for Germany in a thousand years what was done in a single generation by the "Divine brutality of Martin Luther." Similarly, the outburst of anger in Galatians has done more to keep the Christian Church on a purely spiritual foundation than anything else that God has given. Not only did it free the Church from error in Paul's day, but it sounded the key-note of the Reformation and has been the inspiration of every spiritual movement to the present day. It supplies the theme of our praises and the principle of our policies still.

We all know what happens after a brainstorm like Paul's when he wrote the Galatians. You have been contending for some foundation principle essential to your very life. After the heat of the argument passes, the central truth analyzes itself in your mind and you see clearly its component parts and their relative importance. This happened to Paul in the years which followed the Galatian controversy. He analyzed his position; he reviewed the facts of life which made it necessary; and in the Epistle to the Romans we have his cool and comprehensive restatement of the position contended for in Galatians with such fiery ardour.

Next, Paul awakened to what his victory had cost. He saw on reflection that his insistence on this necessary principle had

deepened the suspicion and sharpened the antagonism between Jewish and Gentile Christians. There had always been difficulty in bringing them together, and this controversy had intensified the feeling of the rupture. So he set himself to close the breach. First, by the collection taken up in the Gentile Churches for the Jerusalem poor he re-established the old communion of the glorious Pentecostal days, in which, through the communion of goods, the possessions of each became the assets of all. By this he sought to convince the Jews that their Gentile fellow-believers were one with them in all the interests of life, material as well as spiritual. Second, as he had been the man in whom the difficulty centered, he insisted on presenting this offering in person, even though predictions were multiplied of the bonds and imprisonment which awaited him in Jerusalem. Then, when the offering was made and accepted, and the making of it landed Paul in prison, he set forth in the Epistle to the Ephesians his great doctrine of the unity of all believers in Christ. Being born of God means being born into the family of God and into the brotherhood of believers; being rooted in Christ means sharing the common life of the branches; being builded into God's spiritual temple means being builded together on the one foundation. Paul did not change the position of those early years; immediacy of access to God was still the fundamental truth of the Gospel; but, with this established, any sacrifice was worth while which would maintain the Church's unity.

The trouble with much of our modern evangelical Christianity is that we have never followed Paul beyond Galatians. We have never risen high enough to apprehend the mystical union of all believers in Christ. We who are in Christ belong to each other. Each is the complement of the other; each is indispensable to the other. "The eye cannot say to the hand, I have no need of thee: or again the head to the feet, I have no need of you" (I Cor. 12:21). The right hand is a member of the body; it belongs to the inner self and is one of its means of expression. It is also a member of the left hand; each needs the other; each is so incomplete in itself that it loses half its efficiency without the other. Both together are necessary to

the other organs of the body as well as to the head, rendering to it and to them services which cannot be rendered in any other way.

According to Paul, separation from one another means to that extent separation from God. One of God's media of communication with my soul is cut. If it be true that the peculiar personality and experience of each believer qualify him for a service peculiar to himself, then, whatever separates brother from brother cuts each off from the service which the other alone can render. When, therefore, I allow anything to separate me from my brethren in the Lord, I shut myself out from what they would bring to me, and I shut them out from what I could bring to them—I deny myself both privilege and opportunity for a prejudice. Because of these divisions, the Body of Christ is crippled and his Spirit is grieved. This conviction was the fount of Church Union in Canada. No practical necessities would have forced it if this ideal had not first possessed the souls of the people.

If this be recognized, certain things follow. First, vital union with Christ is the only New Testament basis of church fellowship. All other things are secondary, except the necessity of union with God. As a matter of fact the causes of division to-day are usually of minor importance, and this principle requires Christians to do all in their power to remove these barriers between believers in order that the will of Christ for them may be fulfilled (John 17:21).

Second, and as a consequence of what has just been said, the Church must be broad enough to take in all types of Christian experience and character. A young man once remarked:—"There is ——, a genuine Christian no doubt, but so utterly different from me in her spirit and ideals that we could never belong to the same church." There was only one answer to such a statement:—Should not a church be broad enough to include types even as far apart as these? In I Corinthians 12 the Body of Christ is a unity, not in spite of the differences between its members, but because of them. If they were alike they would not need each other; because they are different each is the complement of the other. The very differences qualify them for a richer life and more varied service; there is no fulness of life

otherwise. In the first part of the Book of Acts we find the Church composed of men with quite restricted ideas of the scope of Christianity. But there was such spiritual power in the Church that here and there, in the house of Cornelius, for example, in Samaria and in Antioch, the energy of the Holy Spirit broke forth in unexpected directions, and whenever the Church satisfied itself that the new movement was of God, it broadened its organization to take in the new facts. Wherever the Holy Spirit was at work the Church felt called to follow, and the one requirement was convincing proof of his presence. In spite of all the difficulty, Jerusalem joined hands and hearts with Antioch, even though in everything but their experience of the grace of God they were as far apart as the poles. So it is in the modern Church. There must be a place in it for the severely intellectual and austerely ethical expression of Christianity. On the other hand it will be an irreparable loss to our religion if the emotional type were allowed to disappear. We are not all shaped in one mould. There must be in the Church a freedom and variety of life. Our ideal is not the clipped hedge but the luxuriant growth of the forest, magnificent because so abundant in its life and so diverse in the forms which make up the general impression.

The members of Christ's Body are nourished through their union with the Head. Christ's figure is different, but his thought is the same when He says in John 15:4, 6: "Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; so neither can ye, except ye abide in me . . . If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered." This truth of our vital union with Christ has meant much in my own life. Once when a student in the midst of examinations, I went down to a little church in Montreal and found that it was Communion Sunday. I wondered what blessing could come to any one in so jaded a condition. As I sat there, one verse stood out from the sacred page: "That Christ may dwell in your hearts through faith" (Ephesians 3:17). I had always thought of Christ as enthroned in heaven and, in answer to prayer, sending down what his children needed. Now I saw the fact of his indwelling. I had not to cry to the heavens above, or call to the earth beneath, for help from an absent

Saviour, but He was in my very life, "closer to me than breathing, and nearer than hands and feet." It is impossible to describe all that this meant in the years that have followed. The late Maltbie D. Babcock, of New York, expresses this truth in these verses:

No distant Lord have I,
  Loving afar to be;
Made flesh for me, He cannot rest
  Until He rests in me.

Brother in joy and pain,
  Bone of my bone was He;
Now—intimacy closer still,
  He dwells Himself in me.

I need not journey far
  This dearest friend to see.
Companionship is always mine;
  He makes his home with me.

I envy not the Twelve;
  Nearer to me is He.
The life He once lived here on earth
  He lives again in me.

Ascended now to God
  My witness there to be,
His witness here am I, because
  His Spirit dwells in me.

O glorious Son of God,
  Incarnate Deity,
I shall for ever be with Thee
  Because Thou art with me.

It is by his members that Christ does his work in the world. Armitage Robinson says that the literal translation of our text is: "The Church which is his Body, the fulness of Him who all in all is being fulfilled." In one breath Paul speaks of the Church as Christ's fulness, and of the Christ as being fulfilled. "He would appear to mean that in some mysterious sense the Church is that without which the Christ is not complete, but with which He will be complete." What does

Tennyson mean by the line, "Ring in the Christ that is to be?" Does it not mean that in some sense Christ is becoming, and that, because He is becoming, He is not yet what He will be? Paul is not referring to Christ personally; as Son, He was always perfect, and as Captain of our salvation He was made perfect through suffering; he means that for the purposes of the Kingdom Christ finds completeness through the growth of his Church toward completeness. The saved are the members of Christ's mystical Body. He will be fully developed and prepared for his functions in God's universe only when every member of that Body finds and fills his place. The illustration which Paul uses brings out the idea with precision. The head is incomplete without the body. A person who loses a limb is to that extent crippled; there are impulses in his nature which he cannot put into effect because the faculty for that purpose is missing. So Paul conceives of the Christ without the Church as lacking organs for the functions of his nature, and as gradually growing toward perfection as one member after another is added to his mystical Body. "The Christ that is to be" is the glorified Redeemer and his Church is one living organism, a union of personalities for the fulfilment of the purposes of the eternal.

This idea gives new value to Christian service. A new illustration is needed to bring out the idea underlying the passage. This spring I visited an island in Muskoka and noted with deep interest the condition of the trees. In the autumn I revisited the spot and was amazed at the difference. The life of these trees had sent out new branches in all directions and the luxuriance of the foliage was wonderful. So the life of Christ in us produces new members for his Body in those whom we win to Him. It is his spiritual energy working through us which produces this result.

There cannot be any doubt about what Christ's will means for us in the present necessity. He would have us seek the lost in our own communities and bring the Gospel to all who need throughout Canada and in our foreign fields. As we think of the spiritual destitution of many parts of our own country and the crying need of our foreign fields, we cannot but feel the Master's Spirit moving us to the sacrifice and effort necessary

for their supply. If we ask, Who is sufficient for these things? there is only one answer, Our sufficiency is of God.

F. B. Myer once told that, when he was beginning a tour in Scandinavia, a burden lay on his soul. It seemed so unlikely that any impression could be produced by addresses delivered through an interpreter. While oppressed by these thoughts, an Englishman, who had just returned from a town in Norway, told him the following story:

"It had occurred in a hotel where he was staying in one of the most beautiful parts of Norway, much frequented by tourists.

A little girl was staying in this hotel with her parents, and was at that trying age when small fingers are beginning to find their way about the piano, striking as many wrong notes as right ones; and young nerves do not seem particularly sensitive to the anguish which such attempts are capable of inflicting on others. She knew one or two tunes sufficiently well to be able to make them out with one finger; and with these she made the guests familiar, to their despair.

But one day a brilliant musician came to the hotel, took in the situation, and sat down beside the small musician, accompanying her with the most exquisite improvisation. Each note of hers only gave him a new motif for chords of surpassing beauty, whilst the drawing-room, now crowded with people, breathlessly listened.

When the performance was over, the illustrious accompanist took the little maiden by the hand, and led her blushing round the company, saying, "Let me introduce to you, ladies and gentlemen, the young lady to whom you are indebted for the music to which you have been listening."

It was true. They were indebted to her for the music, because her efforts had led to his magnificent accompaniment; but his part in the joint performance had led to a deep impression, and it was he whom they were destined to remember.

Our efforts may be poor and weak, but they are the occasion for the work of God's spirit. "In all these things we shall be more than conquerors through him that loved us."

GEORGE C. PIDGEON.

THE SECRETARIAL STAFF OF THE FEDERAL COUNCIL, WITH PRESENT POSITION AND DATES OF BEGINNING SERVICE WITH THE COUNCIL

E. B. SANFORD (Wesleyan University); Pioneer of the Federal Council and in the movements which preceded it. Now in quiet retirement. Corresponding Secretary 1908-1912, now Honorary Secretary.

CHARLES S. MACFARLAND (Yale University); Y. M. C. A. Secretary, Pastor, Author, University Assistant. General Secretary. 1911-.

CAROLINE W. CHASE (Bates College, University of Chicago); Literary Assistant. Assistant Secretary. 1911-.

SIDNEY L. GULICK (Dartmouth College, Union Theological Seminary); Missionary in Japan, Professor, Author. Secretary Commission on International Justice and Good-will. 1914-.

WORTH M. TIPPY (DePauw University, Cornell University, Sage School of Philosophy); Pastor, Author, Organizer of Cleveland Church Federation. Secretary Commission on the Church and Social Service. 1917-.

SAMUEL MCCREA CAVERT (Union College, Columbia University, Union Theological Seminary); Seminary Fellow and Lecturer, Author, Editor, Secretary Committee on the War and Religious Outlook. General Secretary. 1917-.

CHARLES L. GOODELL (Boston University, New York University); Pastor, Author, Evangelist. Secretary Commission on Evangelism and Life Service. 1918-.

F. ERNEST JOHNSON (Albion College, Union Theological Seminary); Pastor, Educator, Author. Secretary Department of Research and Education. 1919-.

GEORGE E. HAYNES (Fisk University, Yale University, New York School of Social Work, Columbia University); Professor, Y. M. C. A. Secretary, Economic Consultant, Author. Secretary Commission on the Church and Race Relations. 1922-.

WILL W. ALEXANDER (Scarritt-Morrisville College, Vanderbilt University); Pastor, Y. M. C. A. Secretary, Organizer and Secretary Commission on Interracial Co-operation (headquarters Atlanta, Ga.). Advisory Secretary Commission on the Church and Race Relations. 1922-.

BENSON Y. LANDIS (Moravian College, Columbia University); Director of Social Research, Managing Editor, Editor, Author. Associate Secretary Department of Research and Education. 1923-.

ADOLF KELLER (Universities of Basel and Berlin); Pastor, Professor, Author, Secretary Swiss Federation of Churches. Secretary in Europe. 1923-.

JOHN W. HERRING (Oberlin College, Chicago Theological Seminary, Columbia University); Pastor, Lecturer. Secretary Committee on Good-will between Jews and Christians of the Commission on International Justice and Good-will. 1924-.

BENJAMIN S. WINCHESTER (Williams College, Chicago Theological Seminary, University of Halle, Germany); Professor of Religious Education, Pastor, Editorial Secretary, Author. Secretary Commission on Christian Education. 1925-.

JAMES MYERS (Columbia University, Auburn Theological Seminary); Pastor, Author, Personnel Director. Industrial Secretary Commission on the Church and Social Service. 1925-.

WALTER W. VAN KIRK (Ohio Wesleyan University, Boston University School of Theology); Pastor, Student Leader, Contributor to Religious and Secular Press. Associate Secretary Commission on International Justice and Good-will. 1925-.

JEANNETTE WALLACE EMRICH (Boston University, Pratt Institute, Hartford Theological Seminary); Missionary in Turkey, Head of Women's Work Near East Relief, Special Lecturer for Y. W. C. A. Associate Secretary Commission on International Justice and Good-will. 1925-.

WILLIAM L. DARBY (Cumberland University, Union Theological Seminary); Pastor, Secretary Washington Federation of Churches. Secretary Washington Office of the Federal Council. 1925-.

KENNETH D. MILLER (Princeton University, Union Theological Seminary); Pastor, Associate Director Presbyterian Board of National Missions, Y. M. C. A. Secretary, Author. Secretary Commission on Relations with Religious Bodies in Europe. 1926-.

W. W. PEET (Grinnell College); Missionary in Turkey; Director Relief Work in Near East. Representative of the Committee on Relations with Eastern Churches. 1926-.

Grateful mention should be made of the staff of women who serve as private and office secretaries, who are the constant and faithful support of the Council's secretaries.

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING

The Federal Council Through the Eyes of Church Leaders

THE denominations look to the Federal Council most of all to promote the spirit of co-operation among them. There is great need for a solidarity of Protestantism which shall be as great as the solidarity of Roman Catholicism, but which shall center around the carefully thought out allegiance of the respective bodies to great central ideas and movements. This can only be brought about by mutual intercourse, by discussion, and by conference. The Federal Council should be the co-ordinating and informing instrument.

Nothing is more significant than the increased co-operation of the Protestant denominations manifested in recent years. They are working together in many admirable ways. They are speaking as one voice on great moral and international issues. They are co-operating rather than competing. Much of the old sectarian animosity has passed away. All that is left of it is rapidly passing. The Federal Council has been a great contributing agency to this consummation so devoutly to be wished. Personally I do not advocate the abolition of denominations. They are divisions in the great Christian army. The Federal Council is to these different divisions what Marshal Foch became to the armies of the Allies in the late war. While the Federal Council has no such authority as was given Marshal Foch it does have the stronger and more significant authority of the commanding strength of ideas which, when properly advocated, unify the forces even more thoroughly than the armies of the Allies were unified.

The Federal Council now has, and may have, great influence in making the impact of a united Protestantism in foreign countries where little or nothing is known of our different divisions.

Under proper restrictions and with due authorization the Federal Council, representing more than 20,000,000 adult church members, may speak with tremendous power and influence on great social, moral, and economic questions. On these questions we must speak not as Baptists or Presbyterians but as *Christians* and we need the Federal Council to focalize our efforts.

[From Bishop Thomas Nicholson, Detroit, Mich.]

We of the Universalist Church have been a pioneering religious body for more than a century and a half. In the realm of religious thought we have kept pace with other leaders in proclaiming the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man. Of one blood God created all races and nations of men. All through our history we have insisted that beneath our diversities of belief and organization there is a deep underlying unity.

Most thinking men and women to-day accept this affirmation theoretically as the statement of a self-evident truth. Our next obligation is to apply this truth to all human relationships. The vindication of truth in argument and logic is always easier than the task of inspiring people to live in accordance with the truth that has been discovered.

Once again we desire to go forward with the pioneers of all creeds and of none, whose absorbing passion is to translate love into action and faith into works. We would unite, in spirit and devotion, with our fellow men of all sects and nationalities in a supreme effort to make Christ's law of Universal Brotherhood the universal practice of life.

As a church we would think not of ourselves primarily, but of humanity and of the Kingdom of heaven on earth. Our prayer is that we may magnify the things which unite us and minimize the things which divide us. We have learned of your efforts, and those of the association with which you are connected, to promote the practice of Brotherhood among industrial groups in various towns and cities over the country. We wish to assist you in this important work. To this end I have the honour to tender you, and, through you, to the Federal Council of Churches, this check for $7,000 to be used in furthering this commendable enterprise to which you have given so much of your time and thought. May God bless you and your colleagues in your labour of love.

[From Rev. John Smith Lowe, in a statement made to representatives of the Federal Council's Commission on the Church and Social Service.]

The development of normal, well-rounded, full-orbed Christians requires their association together, not merely to pray and sing hymns together on Sundays, but to go out and work together the rest of the week for the Kingdom of God in the world, for getting "righteousness, peace and joy in the Spirit" into all human relationships.

It is the realization of that which created and sustains this organization of the Federal Council of the Churches.

In the present divided state of Christendom two things seem possible and necessary: One is the work of this or some similar association, the other is that in every community Christians should get together to apply the principles of Christ to the secular as well as religious life of the community and of the world.

The specific spiritual benefits that come to the workers from such association may be briefly summed up in some such way as this: Gain in breadth of sympathy and a broader grasp of truth from many angles, learning how, first, to put up with one another, then to understand and appreciate one another, and finally to love one another. In a word, such co-labourers with God come gradually and more and more into a realization of what fellowship in the Kingdom means; not fellowship in one denomination; not even fellowship in the Church of God itself, but fellowship and co-operation in the Kingdom of God, in the *Basileia,* which is greater than the Church, the *Ecclesia,* and for which the Church exists.

[From Professor C. B. Wilmer, University of the South, Sewanee, Tenn.]

I have always regarded the Federal Council as a body of Christian brethren who have come together to study as Christians, in the exercise of the right and duty of private judgment, the great question, how are the ethics of Jesus, the teaching of God's Word, the ideals of the Kingdom, to be applied to the social order, that is, to the whole of life, business, politics, social relations, and every point where one human life touches another.

Its functions, therefore, are purely advisory and helpful, not in the way of magisterial or lordly prescription, but of brotherly counsel, advice, and agreement. In the present divided condition of Christendom the only certain method of securing such an assembly of Christian disciples for joint study and counsel, in the hope of reaching a consensus of view which will be practically influential, is for the different churches to appoint representatives to this Council, which exists for the purpose I have attempted to describe.

Let the good work go on. I believe this Council is an increasingly valuable factor in our American life and in the work of our American churches.

[From Professor Thornton Whaling, Presbyterian Theological Seminary of Kentucky.]

The divisive and sectarian spirit that expresses itself in competitive rivalries has too long been the scandal of American Christianity. We must become conscious of our fellowship in the heritage of faith. The Federal Council must help us to gain this consciousness and then become the means of the expression of it to ourselves and to the world.

The growth of secret organizations, confessing Christian purposes and seeking to effect them by un-Christian methods and so defeating the very purposes they seek, is a nemesis upon the free churches of America, resulting from their failure to realize their essential unity and the resulting failure to give any adequate expression to that unity.

The denominations ought to want the Federal Council to lead them in finding and undertaking those Christian tasks in our country and in the world which the denominations cannot accomplish unless they undertake them together.

[From Rev. Rockwell H. Potter, Minister First Church of Christ, Hartford, Conn.]

If I want to get a report on industrial affairs, I go first to the information service of the Federal Council of Churches. Next, the New York *World* probably makes the best statements concerning the labour situation in the country. I wish to record here my thanks and appreciation, and the thanks and appreciation of a great many people I know of, to the splendid service being rendered by the Federal Council's research department in holding the facts squarely before the people.

[From Bishop Francis J. McConnell, Pittsburgh, Pa.]

The Federal Council Through the Eyes of Laymen

Profoundly impressed by the high ends and thoroughly practical achievements of the Council, I should be glad of an opportunity to express, to the gathering, my hope for its continuing usefulness, and my appreciation of what it has done in the past. To my regret, an absence from Washington, at the time of this gathering, is impossible. I am constrained, therefore, to express the hope that you will be good enough to communicate my good wishes to the members of the Council, my appreciation for the kind expressions you have communicated, and my high hopes for the fullest measure of useful service on the part of this splendid organization.

[From President Coolidge, in a letter to the Executive Committee of the Federal Council.]

Supported by a large number of denominations with representatives who see things conscientiously from a different viewpoint, it is exceedingly difficult to outline a policy which will be confirmed by all; however, the policies which have been followed by the Federal Council during the past two or three years have my hearty approval.

I do not read carefully everything which the Council sends out, but most of the literature is read for me and I am delighted with the forward-looking, vigorous, courageous way in which the problems of society are met by the Federal Council. People are coming to know that when the Council takes a position, it has given exhaustive consideration to the question and its arguments will bear full investigation.

I hope that the Federal Council will proceed to handle the two great questions of industry and war in the same way in which it has been handling these questions during the past few months.

[From ex-Governor William E. Sweet, Colorado.]

It is but natural that I, as a layman and a business man, should feel that many of the principles that make for honest business success should be applied in carrying out the Christian programme. We are engaged in the greatest work of mankind, the promotion of Christian ideals and social betterment. And we have reached a stage where we must apply the same principles of efficiency to our religious activities that are applied in modern business.

That means sacrifice not only from the individual, but also from the denomination in order to bring about economy and co-operation for the benefit of all.

The fact that the Ohio Council of Churches is seeking to apply better business principles to Christian activities will bring us the full support of the Christian business men. These men have at times been disposed to criticize what seemed to them to be inefficient methods of church organization. While many of these criticisms may not have been justified, we must admit that some of them were. However, I feel that the Ohio Council of Churches can now show to these business men an efficient organization that has united most of the Protestant bodies in co-operative work.

[From Harvey S. Firestone, Akron, O., in *Ohio Christian News.*]

May I also say how deeply interested I have been in the work of the commission of the Federal Council, of which you have been chairman for the last quadrennium, which post I understand Mr. Wickersham is now taking as your successor? The work of the commission in connection with the Washington Conference on Limitation of Armaments commanded my highest admiration, as also the more recent efforts of the commission on behalf of American adherence to the protocol of the Permanent Court of International Justice.

Under right leadership, with sane and constructive policies, this commission has great possibilities of service in the promoting of world peace based on the spirit of international justice, fair dealing, and good-will.

[From Hon. Elihu Root, in a letter to Dr. John H. Finley.]

I commend heartily the proposal of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America to use Armistice Day to express to the people of the country the importance of stimulating understanding of the problem of securing world peace, so that the tragedies of war may be avoided.

The Federal Council of Churches is conducting its campaign in the interest of peace in accordance with correct strategic principles, for its real mission is to develop the understanding of the American people, capture their interest, and win their support.

[From Major General John F. O'Ryan.]

Dependent upon approval by a general meeting of Protestant and Catholic clergymen, the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America and the National Catholic Welfare will be invited to make a survey of conditions in the Passaic-Garfield textile district. Such a survey would have value as showing just what conditions happen to be. If they are bad, we would have a disinterested body's word for it; if good, the same. The investigators should, of course, have a general knowledge of conditions in textile fields elsewhere. That investigators coming under such auspices would come with open minds is certain.

[From an editorial in Passaic (N. J.) *Daily Herald,* May 6, 1926.]

The meeting of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, in Atlanta, Ga., in quadrennial session, was indicative of one undisputed trend, namely, the utilization of pub-

licity as a new form of evangelism and Christian education. Whenever a central agency such as the Federal Council, which, in many of its actions, has the confidence and co-operation of the Catholics and Jews, brings a united message through the columns of the daily press, it is reaching the public in a wide and wholesome sense.

[From an editorial in *The Times,* Chester, Pa.]

The Federal Council Through the Eyes of the Religious Press

We are more and more impressed with the inestimable service which the Council is rendering to American Protestantism—a service which is too little known and thus too little appreciated by our constituent denominations. There are two distinct movements to-day working toward Christian unity. One looks toward organic unity, which it approaches through an effort to bring the various religious bodies to accept one faith and organization. The other looks toward unity, not through uniformity of doctrine but through mutual helpfulness in life and work. This is the Federal Council idea. The Council is succeeding in giving American Protestantism a voice and in making that voice heard. It is arousing the conscience of our churches upon matters that are vital to the Christian message and the common good. It is giving to the great issues of the hour a united Christian impact that has heretofore been clearly lacking.

Too often organization hardens the arteries through which the life-giving streams of progress flow, and sometimes we have felt this limitation in connection with the policy and action of the Council. On the whole, however, and increasingly so, the Council is stepping into the forefront of real leadership and is pointing the Church of America forward on the great issues so pregnant with weal or woe. This is notably true in its work for an internationalism of good-will, for wholesome race relations and for a system of social and business procedure that will conform to the standards set by the Sermon on the Mount. The churches owe much to the devoted, progressive work of those men of spiritual perception who are leading us forward in these various fields of Christian service.

To appreciate something of the great advance in Christian fellowship, it is worth while to think back twenty-five years or so to the days of sectarian consciousness and then, in contrast, to experience the rich interdenominational fellowship of a Federal Council meeting of to-day.

[From *The American Friend,* Richmond, Ind.]

We have schooled ourselves to believe that sin is the main difficulty in the way of establishing the Kingdom of the Lord. And that is true. Once we have subdued the world and the flesh and the devil the universal reign of Christ will come. But how is the feat to be achieved? Can it ever be accomplished while believers persist in seeking spiritual solitude? No. The work of building the Kingdom of God can never be a solitary process. It is a task which, more than any other, requires not only singleness of purpose, but the intermingling of spirits and the blending of forces as well. And while the walls of the New Jerusalem are sure to be built in spite of every human misunderstanding — for the Lord Himself has ordained it — yet their construction is being delayed because the workmen "are separated on the wall, one far from another."

That is one of the saddest commentaries on our modern Christian life. It is easy to see why men who vow allegiance to contending sovereigns, and are striving for different goals, should stand apart. But it is difficult to see why men who honour the same Lord, who seek a like destiny, and join daily in the prayer, "Thy Kingdom come," should not have a common love, and share their mutual task in brotherly sympathy and practical helpfulness.

[From Rev. George K. Barnford in *The Presbyterian Advance,* Nashville, Tenn.]

We believe that practically all the communions represented in the Council feel at last that they have in it a common voice, an organ through which Protestants can speak as one great, united body, and that the time has come to openly and frankly recognize this and use it more and more as the mouthpiece of the churches.

Here is the place to say, and say rather emphatically, that this is the greatest asset Protestantism has gained in its history in our country, and that any communion which refuses to participate in it is not only curtailing the power of any united service or message to the world, but is also greatly limiting its own opportunity to make itself felt in the great enterprises of the Kingdom.

[From Dr. Frederick Lynch, in *The Christian Work.*]

It is a matter of genuine hope and enheartenment that this great and influential voice (that of Dr. Cadman, as president of the Federal Council) is being dedicated so fearlessly to the

task of bringing about a larger measure of unity and good-will among the jarring elements of this nation. Dr. Cadman, with the eye of a statesman and prophet, both of which he is, clearly discerns the fact that no nation, and least of all a republic like ours, can long endure if its various classes and races and religions begin warring each other, or fomenting those suspicions and hatreds out of which wars inevitably come. He knows far too much of history not to be aware of the insidious perils which lie deep-hidden underneath those claims of class and group superiority which, in the name of patriotism, would set one element of our nation over against the other to subdue it and to rule it. Whether Protestant, Catholic, or Jew, whether native born or foreign born, that spirit is disruptive of the only unity on which Christianity can survive or our nation endure. Says Dr. Cadman:

> Group strife is the rock on which every civilization has split. He who cherishes hate is a part of the great conspiracy that draws us into universal struggle about every twenty years and that makes the white man the most dangerous thing on all the earth. We have seen other empires and kingdoms, whose very names were synonyms for stable government, scattered like leaves in an autumn gale. I do not believe that this fate will visit our country, but I do believe that any nation which usurps just principles, or breaks contracts, or annihilates good-will, or that sets up hate and prejudice and misrepresentation instead of intelligence, education, sympathy, and love as the great motive forces of a definitely ordained society, will disappear from the face of the earth by the judgment of Almighty God. So fell Rome of ancient memory and so fell Greece—so would fall America if she persisted in the way of strife; for it is the gulf which would become her grave.
>
> As affairs now stand we too often meet to emphasize our differences and minimize our agreements. Destruction lies that way. Our mission is rather to emphasize our agreements and respect our differences, and labour for the development of a common mind.

[From *The Herald of Gospel Liberty,* Dayton, Ohio.]

An unknown writer of the second century summed up the early Christian tradition when he said: "What the soul is to the body, that are Christians in the world. For the soul holds the body together and Christians hold the world together. This illustrious position has been assigned to them of God, which it were unlawful for them ever to forsake."

What incalculable weakness to the Church that it has so largely lost this ideal which it "were unlawful for them ever to forsake"! Split up into national churches, the political state has sometimes even had official control of the Church. Even when free in theory, the Church has often been almost as dominated by the spirit of nationalism as if it had been a state church. The exaggerated nationalism which has char-

acterized the political world has invaded the Church and left it crippled as a result. As Bishop Brent said at Stockholm, the Church that ought to have *Christianized* the nations has itself been *nationalized* instead.

In war-time, this is clearest of all. Then Lutherans in Germany kill brother-Lutherans in America; Roman Catholic Austria fights Roman Catholic Italy. Few of us in war-time are any longer conscious of belonging to one fellowship; we become that saddest of all spectacles—hyphenated Christians. And even in times of peace, so much of division and isolation and lack of genuine fellowship among Christians of different nations remains as to make sad mockery of our great belief in "one holy catholic Church."

The great thing about the Stockholm Conference is that it kindles new faith in the possibility of the Church's becoming truly a universal fellowship. This it is which justifies all the work and money and prayer that went into it. The Conference was the most magnificent illustration of the supra-national character of the Church that the modern world has ever seen.

[From the *Federal Council Bulletin,* New York.]

The Federal Council Through Foreign Eyes

The most important development in America since my first visit (thirty years ago), so far as the activity of the churches is concerned in regard to social problems, is the creation of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. This Council dates from the year 1908 and anticipates in action what is at present only the vision—the great vision—of Bishop Temple as President of the Christian Council of Politics, Economics, and Citizenship, and Bishop Gore in his Social Crusade. The Federal Council has co-ordinated, and is increasingly co-ordinating all the forces of the churches, in the effort to solve great social problems.

[From Sir Henry Lunn, in *The Review of the Churches,* London.]

A visit to the headquarters of the Federal Council in New York is to see what America can do in interdenominational organization. Great Britain has nothing of the same kind which approaches it in its resources and in its range. It is the common ground for the social activities of twenty-eight Protestant bodies with an approximate membership of more than

twenty millions; it is the laboratory in which the churches of America are seeking collectively for the solution of difficult problems which none can solve alone.

The department with which we were immediately concerned was that of the Commission on International Justice and Good-will, whose secretary is one of the ablest workers on behalf of international reconciliation, and is looked upon as an authority on questions affecting the Far East—Dr. Sidney L. Gulick. So highly does the Federal Council think of the record of the commission and of the importance of its work in the future, that it has given Dr. Gulick two associate secretaries and set down in its budget for 1926 a sum of over £11,000.

The general secretary of the Federal Council is Dr. Charles S. Macfarland; in its present form the Council is largely his creation. Dr. Macfarland's reputation is world-wide and he holds honourary degrees from such ancient seats of learning in Europe as the Universities of Paris and of Geneva. Had he chosen to give to business the genius which he has shown in building up the Federal Council, Dr. Macfarland might have made fortune upon fortune. Happily he has consecrated his rare gifts to the service of the churches of America and, through the churches of America, to the whole Protestant world.

[From Rev. Gwilym Davies, Cardiff, Wales, in a pamphlet printed in Wales after his recent visit to America.]

There is gratifying evidence both in Australia and New Zealand of the development of co-operation among the Christian churches and in Christian work. Each state of the Australian Commonwealth has a church council in which the representatives of all the churches meet together regularly to formulate a policy of common action on the vital issues of social and community life. Unfortunately in Australia the Church of England does not participate in very many centers which, of course, lessens the value of the co-operative movement. The Church of England does, however, in New Zealand co-operate in a movement that is known as the Council of Christian Congregations. In Christchurch and Auckland there are strong organizations. As a result of the Lambeth Conference in London, the Church of England in the Dominions was willing to unite in federated activity as congregations although not as churches, and the experiment in New Zealand is a notable one. There are many Christian leaders in both Australia and New Zealand who are thinking in terms of an organization similar to the Federal Council of the Churches of

Christ in America. Many are hopeful that before many years have passed something of the kind may be firmly established in both countries.

[From Harry N. Holmes, in an address after his recent return from Australia.]

The endeavour to unite the Protestant Churches of Czecho-Slovakia into a free federation is nearing its realization. First of all it was necessary to remove the distrust, which appeared where one would least expect it, among the smaller denominations. The Federation was proposed as an association of all churches, but principally for the protection of the smaller ones.

The larger churches have no need of counting on any advantages of protection. But at first the smaller churches expressed fears that they might be overruled and hindered in their missionary and expansive endeavours, which was very surprising. We hope that these fears are dispelled. Without doubt, the Federation ought to be a forum for a common working plan, according to which the work ought to be apportioned, divided, and regulated, but nobody dreamed of limiting or hindering others through the Federation.

There also arose at the very beginning another difficulty which was not expected. Some expressed or indicated desire that a statement on the common fundamental beliefs on which the Federation stands be placed at the head of the constitution. Others argued that this is on the one hand very difficult, as the churches to be associated differ in forms of piety, in dogmatics. The opinion that it would be sufficient if the introductory clause emphasized the spiritual union in Jesus Christ finally gained the victory. The proposed constitution will now be brought before the executive bodies of the different churches.

[From Professor F. Zilka, Dean of Theological Faculty, Prague, Czecho-Slovakia, in *Federal Council Bulletin.*]

The Chinese Church is seeking for unity among the various church bodies. The introduction of denominationalism of the West into China has not met with a warm reception. To lay stress on such differences and to perpetuate such divisions in China is not only working against the highest hopes and desires of the Chinese, but is putting upon the shoulders of the "weak brethren in Christ" a yoke that is uncalled for, unnecessary, and undesirable. We would not for a moment speak slightingly about such differences in the churches of the West. They

have no doubt in times past been of real value, though may it not be that even at the best they have served their day? But the Chinese Christians do not welcome such denominationalism, because it belongs to somebody else and not to them. David's victory over the giant enemy was not achieved by wearing the armour of Saul. There is no reason why, in accepting Christianity, Chinese Christians should accept also the many diverse institutions and traditions of the West with the shaping of which they have nothing to do and in which they are not interested.

When the churches in Canton desired to come together to form a united body, the union was formed naturally and easily; seven denominational bodies united under the name of the Chinese Christian Church of Canton. Similarly in the Amoy district the Presbyterian and the Congregational Churches have joined hands and became one ecclesiastical family.

It is not practicable for all the churches so to unite at the present time. Other measures, however, have been taken whereby missions and churches may confer and work together in matters of a common interest, leaving the denominational integrity undisturbed. In higher educational work, in city-wide evangelistic activity, in Christian literature, and in many other directions, united efforts have yielded much fruitful result. A National Christian Council has been formed, which will carry on the work begun by the China Continuation Committee and will greatly strengthen the tie of Christian unity.

[From Rev. C. Y. Cheng, Chairman of the Shanghai Conference in 1922, which created the National Christian Council of China.]

In all the strenuous days since the war the German churches did not lose their courage. Their task was to reorganize themselves and to give themselves a new constitution adapted to the entirely changed conditions. This has been successful everywhere. Upon a presbyterialsynodal foundation all our national churches have been transformed into entirely independent free churches able to manage their own affairs. And they had the faith to envisage, beyond this, a more complete amalgamation of their forces in the shape of the German Evangelical Church Federation. It has, in important questions, executive powers binding upon the allied churches. It is now possible to speak of the "German Evangelical Church" as an organic unity.

[From Dr. Julius Richter, University of Berlin in *The Christian Century,* Chicago.]

I should like to give expression to a thought which gains upon me more and more. The work done by the Central Bureau for Relief of the Evangelical Churches of Europe (initiated by the Federal Council) is not exhausted in material aid. It has a far greater ideal value. It is one of the factors, and indeed one of the most important ones, which contribute to international understanding, to ecclesiastical understanding, and hence to unity and peace.

[From Bishop John L. Nuelsen, Zurich, Switzerland.]

The Community Church

THE outstanding sins of Protestantism are over-churching and its companion, under-churching. The first is largely responsible for the latter. We do not have too many churches in the United States, but too many churches are wrongly located; so we have two or more where there is room only for one and none where there should be one.

A Sunday-school missionary, after years of experience, writes: "Our concern with reference to the over-churched condition found in hundreds of small towns and rural communities should not blind our eyes to the fact that there are thousands of rural neighbourhoods and hamlets which have been overlooked by all denominations in their great zeal to take possession of the so-called strategic points."

We find this over-churched and under-churched condition not only in the country but in the cities also. There are too many churches in the residence districts and too few in the foreign sections. Chicago needs a dozen Olivet Institutes, also dozens less of competing churches in the suburban districts.

One of the saddest things of present day rural life is its paganization. All over our land, in the older settled East, as well as in the newer West, there are rural communities that, so far as religion is concerned, might as well be in the heart of Africa. Dr. C. J. Galpin says that over a million and a half farm children live in communities where there is no church or Sunday-school. In many of these now destitute communities there were formerly churches, often two or more competing ones. These are now dead, killed in some instances by a complete change in the population, but too often by competition which, had it been lacking, they could have survived in spite of the change in population.

We are beginning to realize the need of a more efficient programme in religious education. We find in most country com-

munities very little worth while young people's work. The great reason for this lack is that the young people, divided among several churches, are too few in any one for effective religious education or an interesting young people's organization.

What is the solution? The community church is the solution. By the community church I mean one church for each rural community or for so large a section of a city community as to assure a church strong enough to do the needed work.

Possibly the greatest hindrance to church union is ecclesiasticism as represented by district superintendents, mission secretaries, and their equivalents in all denominations, ably seconded by many of the editors of the denominational papers. In one case of which I know an officer persuaded some of the members of his denomination to go back on their signed agreement to fuse their church with others into a community church. In another town a minister was sent to a church long vacant, sent against the wishes of its members, to keep that church out of a federation.

The community church, notwithstanding such obstructionist policies, is on its way and increasing in numbers, so that now there are about fifteen hundred in the United States.

Community churches may be divided into three classes. The first is a church of some denomination with terms of membership broad enough to unite all Christians in a programme that will include the whole community. To have only one church in a community does not of itself make it a community church, for it may have no community vision or be of an inclusive type. This one-church condition may be brought about by an exchange of churches when two denominations agree, the one to withdraw from one community, the other from another. In other instances this union will come by the members of the other churches joining one of the existing ones or organizing a church of a denomination not before in the community.

The second form is a federation where two or more churches keep their denominational identity, yet work and worship as one.

The third kind is that of the undenominational union church. There are a number of successful churches of this kind, especially in the suburbs of the cities. They seem better fitted to suburban conditions than to rural.

For a community church there is no single plan that will fit every community. There are some very successful community churches working under each of the different plans outlined above. There is some plan that will be found to fit any com-

munity when the people are in earnest, willing to agree on the essentials, and differ, if need be, on the non-essentials.

The community church does not solve all problems for the village and rural community; but it is a way out of the present intolerable over-churched condition. It has succeeded where it has been honestly tried. It is the church of the future.

The clerk of the Chase, Kansas, Community Church, writes me, "This is the only way for small places; it is just the thing where there is more than one church. We can put on a programme that appeals to folks. The other way, when there were only a few, we could not do this. We have a good Sunday-school and good attendance at both services. I believe that small places like Chase ought to get together. For myself I should not care to go back to the old way with only a few in each church."

The community church means a united religious effort instead of a divided one. If it is favoured simply to save money spent in keeping up the churches it is from a wrong motive. It may mean larger expenditure, not less, and what is saved locally should be that much more for the world-wide work. Our young men are demanding a man's job in the ministry; small competing churches cannot give it—the community church does. No one can deny that the Church is losing ground in comparison to other organizations in the community. Several small competing churches do not compare favourably with our consolidated schools. The community church makes an impress on the community comparable to our modern schools. It would be just as logical to have four schools in a town of twelve hundred as it is to have four churches.

The Master prayed that his followers might all be one. By no stretch of imagination can we call the churches one to-day. The community church is an answer to the prayer of Jesus.

[From Rev. George A. Wickwire, Minister of the Presbyterian Church at Mediapolis, Iowa, in *The Christian Work,* New York.]

Finding Our Unity in Common Service

GROUP strife is the rock on which every civilization has split. He who cherishes hate is a part of the great conspiracy that draws us into universal struggle about every twenty years and that makes the white man the most dangerous being on all the earth.

We have seen other empires and kingdoms, whose very names were synonymous for stable government, scattered like

leaves in an autumn gale. I do not believe that this fate will visit our country, but I do believe that any nation which usurps just principles, or breaks contracts, or annihilates good-will, or that sets up hate and prejudice and misrepresentation instead of intelligence, education, sympathy, and love as the great motive forces of a definitely ordained society, will disappear from the face of the earth by the judgment of Almighty God. So fell Rome of ancient memory and so fell Greece—so would fall America if she persisted in the way of strife; for it is the gulf which would become her grave.

As affairs now stand we too often meet to emphasize our differences and minimize our agreements. Destruction lies that way. Our mission is rather to emphasize our agreements and respect our differences, and labour for the development of a common mind. In the war we had it. If it was possible to find a common mind in the business of murdering, then surely it is possible to find a common mind in the business of peace. If it was possible for Locarno to declare the reign of peace over Central Europe, then it is more than possible for America to rally around the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man and declare peace and good-will to all in our land.

A Unifying Principle

What shall be the central principle in this common mind of peace? Is it not that sublime gift from the genius of Israel that has made Catholic and Protestant alike her debtor: "The Lord thy God is one"?

Mazzini's last words before he died were "I believe in God." That's what every Jew can say; that's what every Catholic can say; that's what every Protestant can say. And saying that, all three line up together on the same side of the vast abyss.

And the other side of this ideal is the brotherhood of all men. America is the great test case of a nation committed to this principle.

Our fathers of yesterday were of many kinds eventually blended together. To-day the sound of the American city is that of a "loom weaving the tapestry" of a new mankind. Some of our people are of little faith. They think of America as having failed to blend its polyglot peoples, and as being, not a melting pot, but a "garbage can"; not a nation, but a menagerie. They scoff at their fellows and exalt themselves. But this is the way of hate and leads to destruction. We must trust and believe in the diversified races that make up our land. The Irish with their mission to nourish the mystic and the romantic; the

English with their contributions for a millennium to law and statesmanship and to the literature and the statecraft of the world; the Scotch who by porridge and the Westminster catechism have built monuments of their thrift and brains throughout the world; the Germans, with Beethoven, Schubert, Lotze, mighty spirits of the past; the Jews, who gave to civilization the idea of one God, the father of all, the rock on which is founded every lasting civilization; the Roman Catholics, who, to quote Principal H. B. Workman, "Furnished for seven hundred years the only center of faith and love and light left upon the earth."

Good-will, Not Merely Tolerance

What is the ideal we seek in the American group mind? Do you say tolerance? Were one to say to his wife, "Mary, I tolerate you," what would be likely to happen? Tolerance is a cheap word of political origin. We do not seek tolerance. We seek brotherhood, understanding, co-operation. It is the great business of religion to unite, and not to divide. To our shame be it confessed that the Church has too often lagged behind the Chambers of Commerce, the Community Funds, the Boards of Education in encouraging people of different faiths to work together. But the last and biggest task of unification cannot be done by the Chamber of Commerce, or the Community Chest. It is lasting unification in brotherhood through service, and this task must be done by the Church. Our highest American ideals must not run merely to richness or bigness. A man or a city which is merely rich or big has gained nothing that endures. Jersey City is larger than was Athens—yet where is the Pericles from Jersey City? Palestine is a little place, less in population than London or New York, yet from Palestine came Moses, Jeremiah, Isaiah, and the Christ. Let our ideal be rather the building of that solidarity of fraternal life in which black, white, yellow and brown, Protestant, and Catholic, Jew and Christian are alike parts of the American family.

Unity, Not Uniformity

Unity does not mean uniformity. A lady recently said to me, "I hope that there will be no differences of opinion in heaven." Heaven itself forbid! Think of saying "me too" to all eternity! No. Minorities are the means of growth. Let us encourage differences so long as they contribute to the larger good. Minorities are more often right than majorities. Indi-

viduals are far more often right than minorities, many of them moving like blazing stars, counter to the direction of their times. No civilization is worth while that does not respect variety.

But while we respect variety, let us unite in spirit and service. Let us leave our theological weapons at the door and gather in the Temple of Brotherhood to do the things about which we agree; take hold as one man of the thorny problems of peace, industry, race relations, in round table discussion groups and forums, where we can sit, all kinds of us, elbow to elbow. Let us put religion into the schools—not creeds, but religion. No one wants his child's mind to be the dumping ground for twenty creeds; but surely Americans can unite in these practical ways upon the religion of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

[From Dr. S. Parkes Cadman, President of the Federal Conucil of the Churches of Christ in America, in the *Federal Council Bulletin,* New York.]

The Attitude of Educated India Toward Christianity

THE question is often asked in missionary circles, "Are educational missions worth while?" The question is a very reasonable one, and needs to be faced in all its bearings without fear. The missionary enthusiast looks at the annual returns of the various societies and finds thousands of baptisms reported from the mass-movement areas. People in their hundreds are clamouring for baptism: they are almost forcing the gates of the Christian Church, and are insistent on their demand of being received within the walls. No longer are they going to be left outside, to be trampled upon by those who call themselves the high-caste men. Only a heartless man can remain untouched by the outcastes' cry. It is a matter of pride to realize that the Christian Church can offer a home and a haven of refuge to those men and women who have suffered for centuries unspeakable insults and indignities from the elect of God—the Brahmin. Statistical maniacs see in these mass baptisms a sure and certain proof that this work demands support and attention, and money spent in this part of the Lord's vineyard should never be grudged. There is ample return for it. But let us beware. Baptism does not necessarily mean conversion. Is it better to have a hundred baptized members of the Church who do not fully understand the implications of the

Christian religion, or to capture one who in his heart bows to the supremacy of Christ and his teaching but is not prepared to go through the ceremony of baptism? If there was anything miraculous or supernatural in mere baptism this world would have been a veritable heaven on earth, but we know it is nowhere near that stage of perfection yet. The change of heart is the first essential of bringing about the Kingdom of God on this earth: no amount of baptismal or confirmation services can do it. This may seem heresy to the champion of catholic and dogmatic Christianity, but that is how many of us Indian Christians feel. I do not wish to imply that mass movements have no value, but all I mean to point out is that these outward signs of success should not be the sole factors in our estimate of the relative values of the mass movements and educational missions. Undoubtedly the missionaries in the rural areas can show us some wonderful examples of the men and women who have been lifted from the depths of degradation—social, moral, and economic—to a height of respectability, uprightness, and freedom. Proofs of the saving power of Christ are to be found in abundance. It has been my privilege to know personally men and women who have undergone a radical transformation in every phase of their lives because of the opportunity of development that the Christian Church offered to them. Their personalities, once in captivity, have been released; and the releasing of human personalities, breaking the chains, setting the mind and body free are the tasks of a servant of Christ. Mass-movement work amongst the outcastes is imperative, but we should not study it as opposed to educational work from the standpoint of results. To the superficial student of missionary affairs the schools and colleges seem white elephants. They swallow up so much of the hardly collected funds. What results do they show? How many "baptisms" can they point to in justification of all the "grants" made to them by the missionary boards? "It is no use," one can hear a man saying; "the educated classes of India are like the walls of Jericho: they will never fall. For thirty or forty years a college has been opened, with a good and capable staff, and we cannot show one baptism for every two years of its existence." It is true that we cannot show "baptisms," but we can show "conversions." There are few men who leave our walls without a change of heart or life. After all, one may frankly ask, what is the task of a Christian teacher, or, for the matter of that, of the Christian Church? Is it to establish any particular form of Christianity or any special kind of civilization? Forms of Christianity and

types of civilization are disputable institutions, but what we cannot dispute or quarrel about is the fact that the *production of Christ-like characters* is the real task of the Church. All else fades into thin air in the presence of that stupendous task. The world cries out to-day for Christ-like men and not for dogmas or creeds. Around these dogmas and creeds a battle royal has been raging through the centuries: they have broken up the Body of Christ; they have led us into channels of action which are far removed from the mind of the Master. We need to go back to the simple evangel, to the bedrock of our faith. Let us try to make men and women something like Christ. If that conception had been the primary and central motive of Christian missions we should not to-day be discussing the relative values of our activities, and not wondering at the same time why an educated Indian is not willing to call himself a Christian.

An educated Indian would like to be, and attempts to be, something like Christ, but he has no desire to be called a "Christian." He has the same prejudice against that label as the missionary who has tried to preach against the term "non-Christian," or a "heathen," or a "Hindu." The tables have turned. The literature of the West, her monthlies, weeklies, and dailies, with their respective points of view, have given the educated Indian an insight into a "Christian" civilization. Just as the missionary in the past has taught that all that is evil and unworthy in India's life is the direct result of her faiths and creeds, so does the Europe-traveled and the America-returned Hindu consider the evil and unworthy side of life in these lands of the West as the direct results of Christianity. "We must not have the Christian's race prejudice in our hearts," said an Indian woman returned from America.

Another Hindu student, who was keen on being baptized, was advised by his father, a lawyer who had been called to the bar in England, to ponder well over what he wished to do. The Father told the Christian missionary: "I am broad-minded enough to let my son choose the path of religion he wishes to follow, but he must do it with his eyes wide open. I want to test him by sending him to the Christian lands of the West for a year, and if he returns convinced of the superiority of Christianity over Hinduism he shall be free to become Christian." It was a fair proposition. The student came, and he saw London, Paris, Berlin, Vienna, and other towns besides, and went back saying "I have been cured of my Christianity." It is well, therefore, to be cautious in future about the comparisons that

we make between conditions of various countries, and to beware of judging others by taking the best in ourselves and putting it side by side with the worst in them. I am afraid that sort of propaganda has too often been employed, because propaganda was the motive, and propagandas are not always the best method of realizing the truth. In our zeal and keenness to arouse missionary interest in our churches, and to swell the incomes of the various societies, we might unconsciously fall into the error of unfair presentations—not in the sense that the incidents we paint are untrue, but that they are not typical, and especially not peculiar to India or China, for their counterparts can be found elsewhere too, even in the "home lands."

An educated Hindu or a Moslem can be credited with some amount of sense and reason. He is not prepared to leave the real fellowship of his own caste or creed for something that he is not quite sure of. He is well aware of the racial barrier in the Christian Church in many lands. He is not blind to the fact that his national hero Gandhi, when accompanied by two English Christians, was refused admission to a white church in South Africa; he knows that two Christian Africans were asked to leave a church in which white people had gathered to hold a service for the deepening of the Christian Life — and these were not oil-covered, repulsive Africans, but educated men. He is gently reminded of the fact that in the early days of Anglican Christianity in India, when Bishop Milman wished to consecrate Kali Mohan Bannaji, one of the saintliest Christians of Bengal, as bishop, the European missionaries and chaplains were not prepared to give the "black man" their loyal obedience. He may well ask if the so-called Church Catholic can offer him a fellowship which he enjoys in his present sect, heathen though it be!

Moreover, is it reasonable to expect a Hindu to give up all his past traditions, his social customs, his various fads and fancies, which he has inherited from his ancestors and which form an integral part of the Hinduism that runs in his blood, in even ten years of Christian teaching? Traditional thinking is a hard thing to give up. Perhaps something of his difficulty might be appreciated by a certain amount of introspection. Will the impatient enthusiast remember that the Church of Christ is at present in a sorry plight. I have been reading with great interest, and I might say with no little pain, the various church organs full of the partisan spirit. Their language and their sentiments toward each other are at times as bad, if not worse, than the attitude of a political paper toward its opponents.

These church papers, alas! so often reveal the mind of their readers. Not only is the Anglican Church itself divided, but the bigger cleavage between the Anglicans and the Free Churches remains unbridged. In spite of the Lambeth Appeal and the Free Church replies we are no nearer reunion, and if we were to be honest with ourselves, we should have to admit that, with the present temper in existence, it is idle to talk of reunion. It will be there the whole time as a wonderful ideal to achieve, and some brave individuals here and there will set the example all right, but so far as organized Christendom is concerned, let us face the fact that the curse and weight of traditionalism is upon us. The Spirit of God is striving within us, his Voice calls us to go on and forward, but our tradition-ridden subconscious self holds us back. Will an Anglo-Catholic communicate at the hands of a Congregationalist? Will the latter accept re-ordination at the hands of a bishop? We know the answer. How can a divided Christendom expect converts to itself from outside? How much easier matters would become if we could but realize that there can never be uniformity of worship or church government, though we can have the unity of the Spirit. We Christians are such slaves of tradition; by what reasonable logic can we expect a non-Christian to give up his traditional faith at our bidding and accept our particular point of view?

Sometimes another pertinent question is asked. How was it that the early missionaries like Duff, William Carey, Miller, and others could show converts to Christianity from amongst their students, and why is the modern missionary unable to show the same results? The obvious answer to that question, besides what has already been said above, is, that the Hindu of to-day is a different man from the Hindu of eighty years ago. Even the Hinduism of the educated man in 1925 is very different from the faith of his grandfather. The contact with the progressive and social message of Christianity has changed the outlook of Hinduism as it was understood and practiced in the middle of the last century. The Hindu who attends our colleges cannot help being struck with the message of service which the servants of Christ are giving him. An Indian must be an outright bigot if he fails to recognize that the social conscience of India has been awakened mainly, if not solely, by Christian missions. In fact, the Gospel in action has been so persistent and entrancing that many have been led to study very closely the mind of the Master who inspires his followers with such sympathetic love toward those unfortunate countrymen of theirs whom they themselves have neglected in past

years. The founders of the Servants of India Society, of the Buddhist Young Men's Association, and the Moslem Young Men's Association owe their inspiration to Christian missionaries and Y. M. C. A. leaders.

Whether India will ever become "Christian" may be a debatable point, but that she will be overcome and captured by the spirit and mind and teaching of Christ cannot be doubted. Whether the organized Christian Church as we know it will ever become an integral part of India's life may again be questioned, but that she will respond to the loving and attractive personality of Christ we need not question.

The last war has still further disillusioned us regarding the claims of Christendom over us. The organized Church of Christ has, in the eyes of the Indian, betrayed Him lamentably. That a War Minister should say openly in Parliament that the pulpits of the churches were their best recruiting grounds makes one ponder how far the Church, instead of being the pioneer of peace and good-will, is in danger yet of being led astray by politicians and diplomats and vested interests. But the remarkable fact is that, instead of throwing Christianity overboard, India's educated men have begun to make a distinction between the Christ of Christendom and the Jesus of the Gospel. The former they will not touch, but the latter is drawing them more and more. To Gandhi must be given the credit of focusing his countrymen's thought upon the Crucified One. By his open declaration, on several occasions, of his admiration for Jesus, and, above all, holding Him up as his great example of passive resistance, he has presented Him as One of whom India need not be afraid. He is no longer a foreign and alien figure, but a loving teacher who comes as the fulfiller of their dreams and the satisfier of their age-long hunger and thirst.

Twelve years ago Dr. John R. Mott came out to India to hold a series of evangelistic meetings amongst the students. The Y. M. C. A. Hall in Madras was full to overflowing. It was a time of a great national revival politically. The very first night he got on to the platform to speak he opened his remarks by saying, "Gentlemen, for the next four nights we shall study together the Personality of Christ." No sooner were those words uttered than a cry of protest went up from the students, "We do not want to hear about Christ, we want to know about our political status." The uproar and opposition were so great that the Madras meeting had to be abandoned. Such was the mood of the Indian student twelve years ago. But the year before last in the same hall, another American evangelist spoke to an

overcrowded audience for six nights, the topic of his address was "The Cross of Christ." No voice of protest was raised, men listened eagerly to the message of the Cross. They were interested in the Crucified Figure of Christ.

At a great political meeting a Moslem leader wished to pay a compliment to Gandhi, the Hindu, and said: "Mahatma Gandhi is the most Christ-like man in India"—not the most Mohammed-like, or the most Krishna-like, or the most Buddha-like, or the most Confucius-like, but the most Christ-like, which means that Christ is the standard by which a man's moral worth is to be judged in future. The following quotations from the pens of some of India's foremost sons may help us to realize in what estimation they hold the Jesus of the Gospels:

Great souled Christ, on this, the blessed day of your birth, we, who are not Christians, bow before You. We love and worship You, we non-Christians, for—with Asia You are bound by the ties of blood. . . . There is no room for Thee there, in Europe. Come, Lord Christ, come away; take your stand in Asia, the land of Buddha, Kabir, and Nanak. At the sight of You our sorrow-laden hearts will be lightened. O Teacher of Love, come down into our hearts and teach us to feel the sufferings of others, to serve the leper and the pariah with an all-embracing love. (A Bengali Poet to C. F. Andrews on Christmas Day, 1921.)

And can this Jesus have been only a man? No, He was God. He was the revelation of God for our time. The Krishna of the Bhagavad Gita and Buddha were also revelations of God, but Jesus is the revelation *for our time*. It is, therefore, incumbent on us to come to terms with Christ. *We want Him and we cannot do without Him.* (A Hindu Lecturer.)

There is no one else seriously bidding for the heart of the world except Jesus Christ. There is no one else on the field. (Brahmo Samajist.)

My study of modern history has shown me that there is a moral Pivot in the world, and that more and more the best life of East and West is revolving about that Pivot—that Pivot is Jesus Christ (A Hindu Professor of Modern History, South India.)

The thing that strikes me about Jesus Christ is his imaginative sympathy. He seemed to enter into the experiences of men and feel with them. He could feel the darkness of the blind, the leprosy of the leper, the degradation of the poor, the loneliness of the rich, and the guilt of the sinner. And who shall we say that He is? He called Himself the Son of Man, He also called Himself the Son of God. We must leave it at that. (A Hindu Professor, Allahabad.)

Now that we are going to get self-government are we ready for it? Have we enough of the spirit of self-sacrifice? In order to get it, it would be well to study and follow the example of Jesus Christ, for He was supreme in self-sacrifice. (Parsee Principal to Hindu students.)

Those who have truly accepted the teaching of Jesus cannot pass their time in ceremonial worship. To them the service of men is true worship. Hard is the self-imposed task. They have left their beds of ease and rest, sacrificed their love of life, and dedicated their lives to the service of cannibals and lepers in far-off countries. For their Master, who has initiated them, is the Son of Man and in his advent, God's love of man has been clearly manifested. For who else has glorified man in every way as He has done? (Dr. Tagore.)

Surely, after these quotations, none can have any doubt as to the attitude of educated Indians toward Jesus Christ. One

last example might help still further to realize the claims of the future.

At a gathering of political leaders in Poona, an American friend of mine asked the most prominent amongst them, "What do you really want? Self-government? You will get it. Sooner or later it is bound to come; but tell me are you preparing yourselves for it? Are you facing and solving those problems which lie at your own doors, not as the result of British rule but of your own social weaknesses? What about the outcastes? What are you doing for them? If it was not for the Christian missionary where would they be to-day? Can you be a nation without the sixty million outcastes, one-fifth of your population, finding a place in your programme?" The political leader hung his head in silence for a while and then raised it and with tears in his eyes said: "Yes, sir, you are quite right; if India is to be a nation, the outcastes must be raised, but it is only a Christ who can raise them." What a tragic cry, and what a challenge! Is that Christ going to be refused to India? God forbid!

[From Shoran S. Singha, of the Foreign Department of the London Y. M. C. A., in *The East and the West,* London.]

The Episcopal-Catholic Movement

In the admirable article in *Christian Work* for November 28, 1925, on the "Catholic Movement in the Protestant Episcopal Church," inspired by the Anglo-Catholic Congress in New Haven, it was stated "that an unusual opportunity was lost for a great leader of the Catholic movement . . . to tell us and the country at large, just what fundamental doctrines the Catholic movement stood for and what motives underlay the Catholic revival." While I do not presume to speak as a leader, I feel that your readers might be interested in some attempt, however inadequate, to set forth the underlying motives of the Catholic revival in the Episcopal Church, as well as in the whole Anglican communion.

Strangers who enter an Episcopal church in which the whole Catholic faith is preached and practiced, often ask in a perplexed tone of voice whether they are in an Episcopal church. It seems to them incomprehensible that Catholic worship should be thus fully presented in a Protestant church. It is not only strangers who think we are queer. Many members of the Episcopal Church would be glad if all Anglo-Catholics would depart and leave them in peace. What then is our defense? What are

the controlling principles which are behind this attempt to restore so many of the outward forms and ceremonies of pre-Reformation religion in a church which calls itself Protestant Episcopal?

It is admitted by almost all intelligent Protestants to-day that in the later Reformation era the reaction against the abuses which were rife in Western Catholicism went too far. Undeniably there were abuses—even Roman Catholics admit that, as may be seen in the article in the "Catholic Encyclopædia" on the Reformation. The early Lutheran reformers had in mind simply a reformed Catholicism. They had no intention of creating a new church or instituting a new religion. They simply wished to purge the patriarchate of the West of the moral, economic, and social excrescences which had fastened like barnacles upon its practical system. The ninety-five theses of Luther were really a plea for sacramental confession as against the abuse of indulgences. It was most unfortunate for the future history of Catholicism that the papal authorities did not heed the protests that were made by earnest and spiritual-minded priests and bishops who had at heart the best interests of the Church. If the reforming Council of Trent had been summoned fifty years earlier there might have been no Reformation at all. But it cannot be too strongly insisted that it was not the first reformers who introduced a novel form of Christianity into the Western world. It was under the influence of later reformers, like John Calvin and John Knox, that the religious system was established which has discarded so many of the traditional elements in the faith and practice of the Catholic religion.

The Church of England, while she did not go so far in the direction of Protestantism as did the Calvinists and Zwinglians and later the Baptists and Congregationalists, nevertheless was robbed of much of her ancient Catholic heritage. It is not strictly in accordance with the facts to say, as has so often been said by Anglican apologists, that the Church of England after the Reformation was the same as the Church of England before the Reformation, just as a boy after having his face washed is the same boy that he was before. A great deal more happened to the Anglican Church as a result of the Reformation than simply taking the smudge off her face. In England it was particularly true that the Reformation was an organized attempt to despoil the church and monastic orders of their property in the interests of royalty and the new commercial nobility.

We may compare the groups of Christians who are the heirs of the Reformation in the modern world to a company of

travelers who, while making a perilous journey across a dangerous country, were attacked by bandits and despoiled of many of their most precious possessions. Some of them were even stripped of the clothes that they wore; many were beaten and left in a semi-conscious condition by the roadside. The imaginary traveler who represents the Church of England fared somewhat better than the others, because he was not robbed of his food supply. The Church of England, because she maintained the apostolic ministry along with most of the ancient sacraments of the Catholic Church, was in by no means so parlous a case as were some of the other churches that emerged starved and emaciated from the Reformation era.

It is the contention of Anglo-Catholics that the Anglican communion as well as all other non-Roman churches in the West (the ancient Orthodox Church of the East was of course in no way affected by the Reformation) should recover as completely as possible the Catholic heritage of which they were mostly robbed by the bandits of the Protestant Reformation. What does this include and what does it exclude?

It includes primarily the Mass and all that goes with it. "It is the Mass that matters." Anglo-Catholics will not be content until the Mass, substantially as it was before the Reformation, is everywhere reinstated as the center of the devotional life of the faithful. Along with this priceless privilege we hope for the re-establishment of sacramental confession, so that in all our parishes penitent sinners may receive the immense consolation and the joyful assurance that come from the consciousness that their sins have been forgiven by Divine authority. We also hope that the worship of the Church may be rendered as it was of old with all the dignity and beauty and richness of Catholic ceremonial. The seven sacraments—Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Matrimony, Holy Orders, and Unction—we hope to see once more taking their rightful place in the spiritual life of our people, ministering to them the requisite grace for all the vicissitudes and emergencies of life from the cradle to the grave.

I have indicated roughly what the restoration of our full Catholic heritage would include. What does it exclude? It excludes whatever has been added to the faith and practice of Christians which has neither Scriptural authority nor the sanction of universal acceptance by all branches of the Catholic Church in the East and the West. In particular there are certain modern developments of the papal supremacy, chiefly political in their application, that are no part of the original

deposit of the faith which was once committed to the saints; also papal infallibility, as distinct from the authority of a general council. They have never been admitted in the East and we see no reason why they should ever be acknowledged in the re-established Catholicism of the West.

This we believe is the path to reunion. We wish that each Christian group might reclaim all those elements of Catholic faith and practice which rightfully belong to all Christians. For some Christian groups this would mean ultimately the reclamation of the priesthood and episcopate. We do not feel any assurance that reunion will come through federation or amalgamation. The inevitable result of most recent attempts at federation has been either that the stronger body has swallowed up the weaker, or that large sections of each have refused to abandon their separate ecclesiastical status and thus three churches have been put into operation where formerly there were only two. This has happened recently in Canada as a result of the attempted merger of the Presbyterians and the Methodists.

Reunion will be possible when each body of Christians shall strive to recover all the privileges and agencies of Catholicism. We do not see why any group of Christians should be content to go on with a truncated religion, deprived of countless spiritual blessings, just because some reformers in the sixteenth century, or later, decided that they should be deprived of them, or the exigencies of the time compelled them to surrender many of the ancient rights and opportunities of historical Christianity. Ultimately reunion will come along this path. It may not be in our day. It has taken four hundred years to land us in our present pathetic plight of disunion and discord. It may take another four hundred years to repair the damage.

Moreover, this process of restoration would seem to be the best cure for Modernism. We can never cure Modernism through the preaching of Protestant Fundamentalism, as it was against the harshness and sternness and aridity and injustice of Calvinistic Protestantism that the Liberal revolt was directed. Few Anglo-Catholics feel that they can take sides with the Protestant Fundamentalists as against the Liberals. If it had not been that Calvin had formerly so completely deserted the old Catholic orthodoxy of the first reformers, such a movement as Unitarianism would probably never have arisen, and modern Liberal Protestantism would have taken an entirely different course. The cure for Modernism is the revival of a pure Catholicism. Perhaps if the Catholicism of the Western Patriarchate had

always remained pure, the Roman Catholic Modernist, as represented by Loisy and Tyrrell, would not have found a foothold in that communion.

The supreme evil of our modern Christian world is disunion. No Christian can long permit his conscience to be untroubled on this score. For it is this disunion among Christians that is at the root of most of the crying scandals of our modern world, moral, spiritual, educational, economic, and political. The question we need to be asking ourselves is what are we doing about it? I do not see how any Christian can dare to face his Maker unless he has done all in his power to heal the wounds in the Body of Christ. We Anglo-Catholics believe that by giving our lives to the Catholic revival in our own communion we are doing something toward paving the way toward the reunion of Christendom. The signs are abundant that there is a similar spirit at work in all Protestant churches. The Protestants of a generation ago, if they could come back to this world, would be amazed to see the advances in a Catholic direction that have been made by their children among the Presbyterians, Lutherans, Methodists, and Congregationalists. The Free Catholic Movement in England, the High Church Union among the Lutherans of Germany, are but precursors of a movement which will in a few years probably be widespread among all orthodox Protestants in America.

[From Dr. Selden Peabody Delany, Rector Protestant Episcopal Church of St. Mary the Virgin, New York, in *The Christian Work,* New York.]

Can America Help the Near Eastern Churches?

MANY who know the Near East—Greece, the Balkan States, Russia, Turkey, Syria, and Persia—believe that a compelling case can be made for the proposition that among the greatest objectives open to the Protestants of America in the next decade is the establishment of vital friendships with the indigenous national churches of that part of the earth. The gravest difficulty in the way of spreading that conviction is not any weakness in the facts of the case, but the inhibiting prejudices through which the most of American Christians look in that direction.

One great trouble is that these Eastern churches represent the religious life of peoples who are themselves but little understood. The very mention of the nations involved touches off an

unfavourable reaction in most American minds. Russia—it's Bolshevist! The Balkans—always in some quarrel! Greece—how silly she was to let Turkey whip her so hopelessly! Turkey—the Armenian massacres! The Armenians—pitiful weaklings! Persia—nothing but Mohammedans there! Syria—what part of the world is it anyhow that they call Syria? With such exclamations nationalistic Americans are more apt to turn their backs on the Near East. A double handful of gold for sorry little orphans, and a partial handful for their education, speak well for American charity, but that's about the limit of any serious American attention.

It is so even with those earnest American Christians who have shown themselves most concerned for saving the lives of the boys and girls who have been gathered into Near East Relief orphanages. It never seems to occur to these kind hearts that they ought also to be concerned about the churches with which these boys and girls will be associated after they have grown to manhood and womanhood—about religious life they are most likely to be identified with as adult citizens of the communities in which they settle when the Near East Relief "graduates" them. To many vigorous Protestant souls, the mere fact that the Eastern churches are all "Catholic," or something like that, is sufficient ground for complete disinterest in them; by that term alone they are branded as superstitious and decadent. This element in our American churches would no doubt give money freely to develop almost any branch of Protestantism in the Near East. But there is no use discussing that; the experience of the American Board of Foreign Missions in this part of the world shows that there is no chance of dislodging the hold of the Eastern churches on any large section of their national constituencies. Religiously the masses of the Near East will be influenced through their indigenous and historic churches or not at all. Protestant churches in the Near East are significant primarily in the degree in which they have helped to form the minds of men influential in the old churches.

But all this points to a new kind of missionary work, which promises only influence and counts nothing in the way of converts to Western sectarian allegiance. That makes another obstacle to hinder its candid consideration as opportunity and duty. It is hard to rearrange the idea of missionary success that has prevailed with American Protestants for a century. Yet it is certainly no small thing simply to exercise influence, when the forces to be influenced are such as these native churches of the Near East exercise. Every one of the countries that we have

named is a country dominated by its church. They are countries that will go the way their churches lead—backward or forward. This is particularly true of Greece and, despite the efforts of the Soviet government to disintegrate religion, I think it is going to prove fully true in Russia. These nations surrounding the cross-roads of Europe and Asia have loomed large enough in the world's eyes to call forth in the hour of their destitution and misery the greatest outpouring of charity that human history has ever known—a charity wholly Christian in motive and derived mostly from the benevolence of church people. Shall, then, those who have given so lavishly to the material wants of the nations of the Near East look coldly on when an attempt is made to direct their attention to spiritual needs in the same quarter? Even if there were nothing more in our minds than the economic and political stability of the Near East, we should appreciate the worth of churches alive to their social obligations and strong for justice between man and man.

Aside from the Roman Church, which is not nationally rooted anywhere in this region except in Syria—and yet, I sometimes think, understands the region better than other religious organizations—there are three external Christian bodies which are more thoroughly acclimated in the Near East than any others, and are, therefore, by experience and knowledge, best fitted to lead in the movement for which I plead. These, as known in America, are the Congregational Church, the Presbyterian Church and the Episcopal Church. If these three unitedly will lead in approaching the Eastern churches with friendly overtures of helpfulness, other American churches will follow. For more than a century the Congregationalists have been in close touch with the Armenian Church, and the Presbyterians for almost as long with the Christians of Syria and of Northwest Persia—the latter chiefly Nestorians. Both have accumulated invaluable prestige in their fields of labour; their works have commended both themselves and their faith. There lie ready before them, therefore, easy stepping stones to the open door that I am pointing out.

Moreover, for all three of these churches, overtures for partnership with the Eastern churches will involve no new fundamental policy. At a time when foreign missions was unconsciously almost as strong for Americanizing the world as for evangelizing it, and when hardly anybody thought of carrying Christianity abroad without taking along the rigid patterns of denominationalism, the American Board at Boston announced deliberately that it wished to "work with rather than

away from the Eastern churches." The Presbyterian Foreign Board adopted the same policy. No Protestant organization among the Armenians was then contemplated. And the formation later of a Protestant community in Anatolian Armenia and in Syria was not a repudiation of that first purpose. It was merely an expedient in the face of difficulties, for at that time Armenian prelates and priests were not disposed to welcome the advent of the American missionaries nor any progressive suggestion from any source. For those, therefore, who did respond to the evangelical message which the Americans brought, separate congregations soon became inevitable, especially because the Turkish government would not tolerate unattached Christians without a "church home." But the spirit of catholicity in which these boards sent forth their messengers was not really disparaged by this temporary necessity of setting up a Protestant community. Congregationalists and Presbyterians will only be returning to their original platform—which deserves to this day the applause of every lover of Christianity—when they offer aid to keep the Armenians loyal and active in their ancestral church. The difference now is that the present generation of Armenian ecclesiastics will welcome the aid.

The greatest statesmanship of the Congregationalists was shown in their planting of schools all over Anatolia. Armenians flocked to these institutions. They learned marvelously, progressing intellectually by leaps and bounds. The students of mission schools soon themselves became teachers of other Armenians. Nowhere in the world has the Christian mission enterprise made more potent use of education. The whole Armenian land was illuminated. But to-day—save for a few exceptions in Constantinople, Aleppo, Beirut, Salonika, and Athens — the Armenians themselves are gone from practically all the communities where the American Board sent its teachers and gathered pupils. Is that educational work, therefore, to be called a failure and loss? By no means. Its harvest is just now ripening in the best promise of the present moment for the future of the Armenian people. To-day practically the whole intellectual leadership for Armenian nationality in all the various territories in which the scattered remnants of the nation have found refuge comes and can come primarily from the men and women who have been trained in the American mission schools.

American schools for Armenians to-day are almost entirely the schools which the Near East itself conducts in its orphanages, and this educational work, together with the provision made by the same organization for Greek, Syrian, and Assyrian

orphan children, constitutes the largest piece of educational work ever undertaken in the Near East. This service simply could not have been rendered except for the intellectual and spiritual preparedness of mission school graduates who, also escaping the massacres, were quick and eager to come to the help of their younger brothers and sisters as soon as Near East Relief began to gather into its arms this flotsam and jetsam of starving childhood. In all the varied aspects of this work of Near East Relief in the different areas where it has been established, several thousand of native teachers and other helpers have rendered invaluable assistance during the last decade, and from my inquiries last winter in Greece, Syria, and the Caucasus I am satisfied that more than nine-tenths of the whole number had at one time or another been under the instruction of American educational missionaries. Many, beyond the local schools, had had further advantage of the three great non-sectarian colleges—Robert College and the American College for Women at Constantinople, and the American University at Beirut. If it has been worth while for the hearts of America to put eighty millions of American money into saving the lives of these orphans, all the other millions that went previously into the missionary educational investment is justified by the one simple fact, if there were nothing else to say in its praise, that it has resulted in saving intelligence and religion also in the boys and girls who are the seed-corn of the future Armenian stock and lineage.

[From Dr. John R. Voris in *The Christian Work,* New York.]

The Church and World Unity

SOME things within the Church need attention if she is to make in a large way her contribution toward world unity.

What about denominationalism, for example? I ask myself how a disunited Church can hope to secure a united world. Christianity from the beginning was one, and this has never been lost sight of. We all believe in one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through and in all. But during the centuries we have thought out many inventions and have multiplied our divisions. The trouble with these divisions is that presently they get men to act as though they believed the part is greater than the whole. It is not only here that people feel the scandal and unreasonableness of our divisions, but all over China and India, as well

as in all other parts of the world. Men are wondering what it is about the Christian religion which makes us preach one Lord, one faith, one hope, one cross and one eternal life and then be everlastingly dividing ourselves one from the other. Somehow or other Christian educators must so bring this question before the youth of our day and so present a way out that Christianity shall once more in the minds of our youth and through their concerted action secure the unity needed.

Given a generous type of men and women and a generous interpretation of Christian truth, we have in our missionary forces the greatest single agency in the world to bring about world unity. In the first place, missionaries are the only people in the world who go and live among the peoples they seek to teach and who learn their languages. The missionary identifies himself with the aspirations of the people among whom he lives. He makes their country his country, their honour his honour, and these are the only serious men in the world who are doing that sort of thing to-day. In some countries practically all education has been initiated and conducted by missionaries. They are seeking to transcend national and racial and every other type of barrier. They are looking for the day when the world shall be one great brotherhood and all of us brothers of God's own family. Already they have brought into this fellowship many hundreds of thousands and even millions of people from other lands, who have caught the same vision and are sharing the same passion.

The Christians of India and China and Japan and Africa would be mightily strengthened in their efforts for world unity if we in these so-called Christian lands could show evidence of the power of the Christian religion. They are saying—"Why is it that with all the millions of Christian men and women you have in the United States and Canada and Great Britain you cannot more definitely make your impact upon the life of the world? Why cannot you bring your power so to bear that we shall receive justice in all our national affairs? Why is it necessary for us to be forced to submit to domination from white people? Why is there so much narrow-mindedness and selfishness and small-heartedness? Why cannot you hold back the dogs of war and the dogs of greed?" Why is it that so many areas of life in your great lands are in rebellion to the law of Christ?

[From James Endicott, in *Religious Education,* Chicago.]

The Practice of Comity

THE word "comity" is comparatively a new word in the vocabulary of churchmen. How many church workers made use of this term a decade ago, or even five years ago? When it came into usage some of us resorted to our dictionaries to discover its true meaning.

The word and principle alike belong to modern civilization —better still, to a Christian civilization. True Christianity knows no class or caste, but all are equal in the eyes of the great Head of the Church. Comity is simply a kindly consideration or courtesy between equals. It is a co-ordinating force. It seeks to live and let live for righteousness' sake, to eliminate all selfishness, unjust pride, bigotry, and intolerance from the Church.

More and more we must come to think of the church universal and our particular denomination as one factor in the great programme of righteousness.

Because a denomination is small is no argument why it does not play an important part in Christian work and should not receive Christian courtesy and kindly consideration at the hands of every other Christian organization. I can name certain denominations that have had a most glorious history, have furnished both churchmen and statesmen and yet are not destined to become great or large. They will always remain small in numbers, but frequently the type of Christian work done by their local churches is unsurpassed. Strong denominations have some very weak local churches, while on the other hand weak and small denominations have some very strong local churches.

The community is the place where the principles of comity must operate in the last analysis. Whatever denominations may be represented in any community, comity must be worked out there and not in some office at headquarters half way across the continent. It has also become apparent that the laity of our churches seem to be more nearly ready to federate and co-ordinate than the ministry.

Every pastor should have denominational pride and aspirations for his own communion, but this must not be at the expense of any other communion, however weak that particular local church or denomination may be. The general principles of comity are recognized and respected to-day by the denominations, but, unfortunately, here and there we meet with some overenthusiastic pastor who seems to have forgotten those essential principles of Christian ethics which make for peace and righteousness. Surely there can be no more fruitful field in

which to practice the golden rule than in the realm of congregational comity.

The many interdenominational meetings and movements are doing much to bring about a better understanding between denominations and between pastors of any given community. Instead of being antagonistic and envious, we are learning to be mutually helpful.

Pride and jealousy and selfish ambition must give way to kindly consideration.

I think we are a long, long way from a union of all the Protestant churches of America or any considerable number of them. But we hail with delight the dawn of the new day characterized by brotherly love, peace and good-will toward all.

[From Bishop A. R. Clippinger, in *Ohio Christian News,* Columbus, O.]

What True Tolerance Is

How incompatible the intolerant mind is with the true genius of the Christian religion is indicated unmistakably in a revealing incident in the life of its Founder. When a group of Samaritan villagers was unfriendly, the angry disciples wanted to call down fire upon these people of another race and another religious tradition. But Jesus pointedly rebuked his followers, declaring, "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of."

There is, unfortunately, a kind of easy-going, spineless indifference, bereft of any positive conviction, which sometimes passes as tolerance, but which is worse even than intolerance. An absence of clear-cut opinions or irresoluteness in standing for what one believes to be the truth is an even greater evil of our day than lack of tolerance.

But true tolerance is an utterly different thing from this. What it involves is no complacent shilly-shallying about my views of the truth, but a recognition of the other man's right to do his own thinking as I do mine, to reach his own conclusions, and then to hold his own honest convictions as frankly as I hold mine. It makes me ready to say with Voltaire, "I disagree with everything you say, but will defend to the death your right to say it." It means that I have so much confidence in the truth that I can trust it to win its way without any other compulsion than that of its own intrinsic worth. I shall reason with the man who differs from me and seek to persuade him by showing him why I believe as I do—but try to coerce him never.

True tolerance means *earnestness of conviction combined with respect for the conviction of others.* It is, as Phillips Brooks once pointed out, a fusion of love of truth with love of men. Strong love of truth without love of one's fellows makes the bigot. It is this which has lighted the fires of persecution in every age. Love of one's fellows, on the other hand, without devotion to the truth makes the sloppy sentimentalist. The blending of the two makes the ardent and, at the same time, tolerant spirit.

[From Samuel McCrea Cavert, in *Federal Council Bulletin,* New York.]

Christian Unity in Practice

In a College Town

As illustrative of the way church unity is developing in America, Rev. James R. Smith, Secretary of the Congregational Church Building Society, tells how the Congregational denominational officials advised the Congregational church of East Lansing, Mich., to withdraw from the denomination and to become an independent body, in order that three other denominations might co-operate with the Congregationalists in ministering to the needs of an entire community. This sort of policy marks an entire change from that of former years.

East Lansing was an especially favourable situation for trying out this form of church co-operation. Here is situated the State Agricultural College, with 2,000 students coming from all over the state and from many denominations. Around the college is a town of about 2,000 people.

For many years there had been but one church in the community, and that a small Congregational church. To this church came a goodly number of students and townspeople. The time came when added church facilities were needed, and various denominational bodies were appealed to for help. But it was found that there were not enough people of any other denomination to build and keep up a church. So it came about that the Congregational national officers suggested that the Congregational church withdraw from its denomination, form a union church, and then appeal to the various denominations to help in building a new church and paying the expense of the pastor's salary.

The four denominational bodies uniting in this practical church union programme are the Michigan Congregational Con-

ference, the Michigan Baptist Convention, the Michigan Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and the Synod of Michigan of the Presbyterian Church.

Each of these state bodies elects or appoints a member of the church as its representative on the board of trustees of the church, and the church members select six additional trustees, making a board of ten, which has in hand the business of the congregation.

A new house of worship costing $200,000 will be built with contributions from the local field and a contribution of $25,000 from each of the four denominations.

On the Canal Zone

The two churches situated at the opposite ends of the Panama Canal Zone, at Balboa and Cristobal, represent twelve years of planning and giving on the part of the employes on the Canal Zone and friends in the States.

The two buildings when completely furnished will represent an investment of $200,000. One-third of this money has been contributed by the missionary boards of the following denominations: Baptist (North), Congregational, Methodist Episcopal, Methodist Episcopal, South, Presbyterian, Reformed Church in America, and United Presbyterian.

These denominations have entered into a trust agreement with the Union Church and with one another, guaranteeing that the Union Church shall carry on evangelical work and that the Federal Council of the Churches shall serve as the holding company.

The rest of the cost of the building has been or will be contributed by individuals and churches in gifts ranging from a few cents to one gift of $10,000; $32,500 is still needed to furnish these two churches and to pay for work already done.

Balboa needs $22,500. The people of Balboa will raise $10,000 of this amount. They have already given $8,500 for the organ.

Cristobal needs $10,000. The people of Cristobal will give $5,000 of this amount. They gave generously before.

Seventeen thousand five hundred dollars of the $32,500 must be raised in the States.

[From *Federal Council Bulletin,* New York.]

What a Local Church Council Tries to Do

JUST what is the Wichita Council of Churches trying to do?

In the first place we are trying to build the spirit of co-operative Christianity among the Protestant churches. There is nothing narrow or restrictive in our use of the word Protestant. We simply recognize that at this stage of the game our first duty is to weld together the evangelical forces which are of a co-operative nature.

Just now one of our major activities is the effort to create that sort of public opinion among all high-minded citizens which will make for law observance and law enforcement. We intend to stress education for Christian citizenship.

This is only a new aspect of a field which we have already entered deeply. Sunday-school work in Wichita is probably better organized on an interdenominational community basis than in any other city in Kansas. We have every reason to be proud of our week-day religious education movement with its five thousand boys and girls in church schools, which are rapidly approaching the level of public school efficiency. Our vacation schools are also an important part of our educational activity. We are seeking now to establish a college of religious education in which Sunday-school teachers, week-day teachers, vacation school teachers, and other church workers may receive adequate training.

All our education is suffused with vital religious purposes. Some of our activities, however, may properly be labeled evangelistic in the broad sense of the word. The intangible results of the great Gipsy Smith campaign are still with us. Not less important is the Lenten programme with its three weeks of outstanding addresses by speakers brought from distant cities.

One of our outstanding pieces of work has been the Mexican work carried on by the Christian women of the city, assisted more recently by the Wichita Ministerial Association. Begun years ago by the help of Mr. and Mrs. A. A. Hyde and other members of Grace Presbyterian Church, this work has broadened and deepened until now Hyde Chapel is nearing completion.

What is much more significant is the marvelous co-operation of the denominations in this enterprise and the cultural and spiritual progress of the Mexicans themselves.

We make slow progress toward formal comity. We do not yet have the letter of it, but we do have an increasing spirit of good-will in matters of city planning and the location of churches.

In international matters we have tried to exert a steady emphasis on education for peace. One of our most significant activities has been along the line of interracial good-will. A survey of Negro conditions, the great pageant, "Milestones of a Race," and most recent the wonderful concert by Roland Hayes, have been the most spectacular of these activities.

The work carried on by our women's department is worthy of special mention. The annual School of Missions and the Day of Prayer have become an established event. Our young people's work promises great things for the future.

It is noteworthy that all the interdenominational activities of the churches in Wichita center in our office. There is not one Sunday-school office and another week-day office and another Council office. We are, to all intents and purposes, one organization.

Further than this, there is in Wichita a very remarkable opportunity for combining economy and efficiency. By its new constitution the Council of Churches has three major departments. One of these is the department of education, the other two are the men's and women's departments respectively. It is the theory of the leaders of the Council that in the years to come, by a process of gradual and patient adjustment, these two departments may be closely articulated with the Y. M. C. A. and the Y. W. C. A. It is our thought that the Christian Associations may be able to provide staff service and render other sorts of assistance of the utmost importance. We feel that five years from now the Council of Churches will really be a clearing-house for the activities, not only of the member churches, but also for the two Christian Associations.

[From Ross W. Sanderson in *Wichita* (Kan.) *Chronicle.*

Community Church Workers Meet

THE third biennial conference of the Community Church Workers of the United States was held at First Community Church, Columbus, O., May 4-6. Delegates came from as far west as the state of Washington. Several came from the east. The bulk of the attendance, however, was from the mid-west as might be expected of a gathering in which delegates meet their own expenses.

The secretary's report, given by Rev. O. F. Jordan, of Park Ridge, Ill., indicated that there is a rapid growth in the number of churches. This was reported as being 1,170 on the latest revised list. It was explained that the figures for community

churches always contain a margin of debate on account of the inclusion of denominational community churches. Just how liberal a church needs to be to be called a denominational community church has never been determined. Of the 1,170 churches, nearly 500 are of the independent type and 400 are of the federated type. A number of the pastors present were from churches which have been organized within the past few months.

The organization has up to this time carried on entirely with unsalaried officials, and with a most modest expense budget. It was decided at Columbus that field workers must be secured to answer the constant appeal for aid in organizing community churches. During the coming biennium there will be an eastern and a western field secretary in addition to the executive secretary who was continued in his office. Mr. Samuel R. Guard, of Park Ridge, Ill., well-known lay pastor of the Little Brown Church, a "laymen's community church on the air," conducted from station WLS, Chicago, was made financial secretary and treasurer and charged with raising the funds. Half of the amount needed was secured at Columbus.

The president for the coming biennium is Rev. Oliver C. Weist, of Columbus, Ohio. The vice-presidents are Dr. O. J. Randall, of Washington, D. C.; Rev. D. Elmer Nourse, of Freewater, Oregon; Rev. Cliff Titus, of Joplin, Mo., and Prof. Dwight L. Sanderson, of Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.

The address of Mr. Samuel R. Guard at Columbus was widely quoted in the secular press. He set forth in most convincing fashion the attitude of thousands of people in America who in their correspondence with the Little Brown Church have voiced their demand for the elimination of over-churching and the setting up of a church with a community-building programme. He declared he did not despair of the co-operation of Catholics and Protestants in one church at the countryside.

Distinguished guests from the outside graced the sessions. The evening speakers were Dr. Fred Eastman of New York; Prof. Alva W. Taylor, of Indianapolis, and Dr. C. C. Morrison, editor of *The Christian Century*. All of these spoke in terms of great appreciation of the achievements of the community church movement and exhorted the pastors and workers of the movement to bring forth fruits worthy of their new opportunity. Dr. Samuel McCrea Cavert, secretary of the Federal Council of Churches, was present on Tuesday, and in his address declared that in many ways the Community Church Workers and the Federal Council of Churches were striving for common ends. The programme this year stressed such themes as community-

building, recreation, the larger use of the lay workers of a church and the ushering in of practical Christian union.

First Community Church, of Columbus, has recently dedicated a new building. It is a fine gothic structure erected in stone at a cost of $300,000. The gracious hospitality of this church was expressed by its entertainment of the delegates without cost. The pastor, Rev. Oliver C. Weist, with a vested choir, led a beautiful and dignified worship each evening preceding the evening address. Each forenoon a Columbus pastor came in and conducted a devotional hour in addition to the beautiful worship of the evening. Rev. M. W. Van Tassell, of McConnellsville, N. Y., presided for two days, and Rev. E. H. Gebert, of Longview, Wash., the last day.

The resolutions of the conference, in addition to the courtesies of the occasion, once more affirmed the purpose of the members of the conference not to permit the community church movement to become a denomination. Many of the churches, a majority indeed, are officially related to some denominational body, and practically all the pastors. However, as one of the speakers asserted, the surest way to prevent denominationalizing the movement is to avoid anything that excludes anybody. Fundamentalists and theological radicals attend the conferences and get along, since no ecclesiastical functions are assumed.

The executive committee of 16 men will be called together at the beginning of September, and will then hear the results of Mr. Guard's financial campaign. At that time final arrangements will be made to launch the new programme.

[From *The Christian Century,* Chicago.]

BOOK REVIEWS

TOWARD INTERRACIAL CO-OPERATION. What Was Said and Done at the First National Interracial Conference. Held under the auspices of the Commission of the Church and Race Relations of the Federal Council of the Churches and the Commission on Interracial Co-operation, Cincinnati, Ohio, March 25-27, 1925. New York: Federal Council of the Churches.

Inasmuch as this number of *The Christian Union Quarterly* is given over largely to the interests of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, it is appropriate that the first book in our review section is an account of a recent conference held largely under the direction of one of the most important commissions of the Federal Council. Here, in a volume of nearly two hundred pages, is the carefully sifted material from an open forum discussion of more than two hundred persons about equally divided between the white and Negro races.

Several weeks before the conference opened a series of questions were sent out as aids in studying local problems. Each topic was in charge of a discussion committee. No attempt was made to restrict discussion, which occupied most of the conference. There were few prepared addresses. Every subject was summarized at the close of the discussion and people went away feeling that they possessed the consensus of the thought disclosed. This volume, therefore, brings together a body of fact, experience, and reasoning that could hardly have been produced by any other method.

The subjects discussed had to do with "Publicity and Race Relations," "Health and Race Relations," "Housing and Race Relations," "The Movement Toward Interracial Co-operation," "Social Agencies and Race Relations," "The Church and Race Relations," "Industry and Race Relations," "The Courts and Race Relations," and "Schools and Colleges and Race Relations." There are excerpts from addresses by Dr. C. V. Roman, Dr. Will W. Alexander, Dr. George E. Haynes, and Dr. Sherwood Eddy. This is followed by a summary of leading suggestions and recommendations, list of suggestive questions, list of delegates and visitors, with the programme of the conference and a list of the committees.

All the discussions are interesting. Under "Health and Race Relations" it is shown that a Negro's chances of being murdered are 34 per 1,000 to 1 per 1,000 for a white. Negro tuberculosis death rate is 370 per 1,000 to 76 per 1,000 for whites. In three years the Negro population increased 8%, while the Negro death rate increased 30%. In Cincinnati the Negro population is 1/9 of the total, while it furnishes over 1/5 the total deaths from tuberculosis, 1/4 of total deaths from pneumonia, 1/3 of the total deaths from syphilis and 70% of the total cases from smallpox. These large percentages are due to Negro ignorance and indifference to health matters and lack of co-operation between white and Negro agencies, but the evidence of

Negro progress is seen in the ratio of improvement in health conditions is greater in Negro than in white population, many cities having hospital and clinical care for Negroes on a par with whites.

Negroes are invariably forced to live where conditions are adverse to health and morality, but the gradual creation of Negro building and loan associations makes it possible for Negroes to move in better sections of the city. The whole problem is being discussed in schools and colleges. Interracial committees and commissions are at work in various parts of the nation. While the problem is world-wide, the beginning place is in our local community. The Negroes and the whites must meet together for this study. The Church should seek to create the attitude of friendliness. So long as we give money for missionaries to go to Africa the white Christians at home must be willing to be missionaries themselves to the Negroes in their community, else their interest in African missions is sheer hypocrisy. This volume leads us to rejoice in the Negro's growth into a larger citizenship and at the same time reminds us of our opportunity to express friendliness along the way. This frank exchange of views lends a large possibility to greater co-operation, in which lies hope both of Negroes and whites.

THE SUPREMACY OF THE SPIRITUAL. Essays Toward the Understanding and Attainment of Spiritual Personality. By Herbert Alden Yountz, Ph. D., Professor of Philosophy of Religion, and Christian Ethics, Oberlin Graduate School of Theology. New York: The Macmillan Company; 183 pages, price $1.75.

The appearance of this book is a distinct call for a deeper spirituality in human experience. Its thought is clear; its challenge is awakening; and its careful reading gives to one an experience in which he delights to linger. It is one of the best books in this field that has appeared for a long time.

Its thought centers around the text, "That is not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; afterward that which is spiritual." There are twelve chapters, discussing such subjects as "The Understanding of the Spiritual Life," "A Missing World: Creative Personality," "The Dimensions of Personality," "The Conquest of Spirit Over Nature," "The Moral Discovery of God," "Jesus: Prophet of Personality," "What Does Life Mean?" "The Permanence of the Spiritual," etc. In one's finding a working philosophy these subjects bulk largely in his thought. The analysis of personality, the emergence of creative intelligence, the development of freedom, morality as a creative capacity of the soul, the certainty of God, and the immortality of spiritual personality are keenly interesting subjects. This interest is greatly augmented under the fascinating presentation by Dr. Yountz.

The whole argument is a protest against the notion that religion is a purely psychological matter and that doing things can never be substituted for being something in the eyes of God and men. He argues convincingly

for those methods by which any man can find the experience of actual sonship and keep his heart open to the hidden springs of life. He shows how Jesus is forever calling all ages back to the supremacy of the spiritual, whose foundations are necessary for a permanent human achievement, and that the greatest peril facing our civilization is the despiritualization of education, religion, and morals. "Naturalism is dispossessing humanism as our philosophy of life. The self is becoming insolvent before the task of spiritualizing society." He maintains that "Behaviorism" is superficial, whether in psychology, ethics, or religion, because it deals with the surface of life rather than the depths of our being.

He makes the theme of his discussion the undeveloped spiritual resources of humanity, the spiritual poverty of our civilization, and the despiritualizing forces which are largely defeating spiritual leadership. His remedy is (1) by a deeper understanding of personality, with a view of creating (2) a better type of experience, in which (3) new resources of life shall be discovered. He courageously takes up the moral task of insisting upon more thinking and better thinking by more people about our great spiritual possession and the deep powers of mastery and attainment within reach. He pleads for a profounder thought-leadership wherein may be found a spiritualistic philosophy. When one conquers greed and passion and selfishness and learns to control and rule himself in terms of love and self-sacrifice, what shall be said of the possibilities of the new world?

Dr. Yountz sees in the rise of the individual the most significant event in the history of the race—a being transformed out of a human animal into a spiritual personality, a dreamer becoming a creator and the idealizer of present reality becoming the author of what was not. Humanity's old fighting spirit is not facing a period of unemployment, but the struggle has been transferred to another field. It is the fight for the mastery of the inner life. Selfishness, greed, lust, and love of power are the survival of our animal past. "The heroes of the future must share Christ's victory, his secret of inner mastery."

The whole book is crowded with great ideas, reminding us of how full the universe is of God and the future hope of the world. It is a fine call to spiritual experience and no thoughtful person can read its pages without stopping to think, underline, and re-read what has been so well said.

THE REASONABLENESS OF CHRISTIANITY. By Douglas Clyde Macintosh, Dwight Professor of Theology in Yale University. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons; 293 pages, price $1.50.

Anything from Dr. Macintosh is a guarantee of worth; but, in this instance, it is the $6,000 Bross prize volume for 1925. This fund was established by William Bross, lieutenant-governor of Illinois from 1866 to 1870, in memory of his son, Nathaniel Bross, who died in 1856. From the accumu-

lation of interest on the sum of $40,000 a prize is offered once in ten years for the purpose of stimulating the best book or treatise "on the connection, relation, and mutual bearing of any practical science, the history of our race, or the facts in any department of knowledge, with and upon the Christian religion." The award is made by a committee of Christian scholars upon invitation of the president and the faculty of Lake Forest College. The competition was to be thrown open to "the scientific men, the Christian philosophers and historians of all nations." The first prize was awarded in 1905 to Dr. James Orr for his treatise on *The Problem of the Old Testament.* The second decennial prize was awarded in 1915 to Dr. Thomas Thorburn for his volume entitled *The Mythical Interpretations of the Gospels.* The third is this volume by Dr. Macintosh.

The main argument for the Christian faith rests solely on the supreme value of its moral and religious content and runs through the discussion of the following subjects: "Apologetics Old and New," "Christian Morality," "Moral Optimism," "Freedom," "Immortality," "God," "Providence," "Revelation," "The Historic Jesus," and "The Person and Work of Christ," followed by chapters on "Knowledge in General," "Religious Knowledge," and "Reality."

He argues that great changes have taken place in belief during the course of Christian history, but greater changes have taken place in the reasons given by Christians for their beliefs. "The modern-minded people are not convinced by the traditional defense of Christianity and no longer take any interest in its arguments." With the Catholics the traditional content was the whole official teaching of the Church, including the Curch's interpretation of the Bible; with the Protestants it was te entire content of the Old and New Testaments. No longer, it is argued, are Christ and Christianity to be believed in because of the miracles. And so "the two distinctive characteristics of the modern argument for Christianity, then, are the choice of the essence of Christianity in place of an entire traditional content and the defense of this essence without recourse to stories of miracle, and between the two the connection is commonly close."

Recognizing Locke as a forerunner of modern apologetics, in insisting that out of the great mass of traditional belief and practice belief in Jesus as the Messiah is the essence of Christianity, but, in his appeal to the miraculous in the Old and New Testaments he is still on the soil of the older apologetics. If the modern apologist is to defend Christianity without depending upon the appeal to miracle, the question of how this can be done is at once raised. There are two main types of answer to these questions—Hegelian, who have taken rationality "as the criterion of the essence of Christianity and have sought to defend this essence as true by exhibiting its reasonableness, whereas the Ritschlians have taken religious value as the criterion of the essence of Christianity and have sought to defend this essence as true by exhibiting its religious value." Neither of these courses being wholly

satisfactory, Dr. Macintosh finds the reasonableness of Christianity as morality and religion and presents in five chapters the place of freedom, immortality, God, providence, and revelation, concluding with the reasonableness of belief in the essential historicity of Jesus and what He did for humanity and the reasonableness of the Christian religion from the point of view of critical common sense.

To the thoughtful mind the whole argument has a strength and an appeal that makes it a most satisfactory volume and one easily awards it a first place among our modern books in dealing with the reasonableness of Christianity.

PAUL OF TARSUS. By T. R. Glover, M. A., D. D., LL. D., Author of *Poets and Puritans, The Pilgrim*, etc. New York: George H. Doran; 256 pages, price $2.00.

Any study of Paul is interesting. When Dr. Glover takes up the task of a new study of the great Apostle it is an invitation to follow not only one of fine scholarship but one whose vigorous style and keen perception are assurances of a new study of one whom so many have studied with profit to themselves and others. This book is chiefly associated with America, many of its chapters being lectures which Dr. Glover delivered when he was in America, at the University of Chicago, in 1920, at the Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, California, in 1923, and at Hartford Theological Seminary and on the Dowse Foundation in Combridge in the same year.

He starts out with a quotation from Gilbert Murray—"He is certainly one of the fireat figures in Greek literature"—and maintains that Paul stands among the greatest of the Greeks, for "who of them, apart from Homer and Plato, has had so wide and so long an influence, who has opened up more of the real world to men, whose words have lived more in the hearts of their readers?" And then from Tarsus and its Hellenistic atmosphere he follows Paul to Jerusalem, where, as a young orthodox Jew, bred in a Greek world, he is face to face with conditions which made his paths troublesome. But he was bound to think his way out, "to hammer it out with reason and fact and his sense of fact is the thing that saves him and confuses his critics." Dr. Glover affirms that the supreme contribution of Judaism to Paul and to the world was freedom from slavery to a book and a code and free for fresh experience with God. The unity of Jewish faith was the "outcome of intense experience and long thought and the promise of clearer and ampler thought."

From the strange experiences of Damascus, which is a chapter of wonderful interest, the uneasy mind of Paul, with its bigotry and open-heartedness, made a new epoch in his life. He gives a whole chapter on "not having mine own righteousness" and in the chapter following, "The Life of Obedience," we have the two outstanding interpretations that made the fascinating

life of the Apostle of the Gentiles. "The Preparation of the Gospel" and "The Church" and "The Human Paul" leaves us ready for his great chapter, perhaps the best of all, on "The Love of Christ." The concluding chapter is a consummation.

There is a freshness, beauty, and courage throughout, based upon a versatile scholarship, that makes this one of the best interpretations ever made of the life of Paul. It has the power of deepening one's acquaintance with one of the greatest personalities of history. Of all Dr. Glover's books, this one has the first place.

MATHILDA WREDE OF FINLAND, FRIEND OF PRISONERS. By Lilian Stevenson. With Introduction by Henry T. Hodgkin, M. A., M. B. London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd.; 159 pages, price $1.25.

This is a book of extraordinary beauty. The Baroness Wrede is one of the most enchanting personalities in Europe. Because of her confidence in those who have lost all confidence in themselves she may be called the prophetess to the "untrustworthy." Our first acquaintance with her was at Bilthoven, Holland, in 1919, at a meeting of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, and we have been friends ever since.

She is a reconcilor. When her country was torn by the radicals and the conservatives, the former often spoken of as the "reds" and the latter as the "whites," she thereupon adopted red and white as her colors and kept blooming in a jardiniere in one of her front windows a red flower and a white flower, saying to all that she was the friend of both sides for both were her countrymen. She was at the Stockholm Conference in 1925. It was a joy to see in her face the testimony of a living faith and to hear again of her undaunted courage in friendship for the prisoners.

The story of these pages is the record of scientific approaches, resulting in lives remade and insoluble problems solved. Never robust and shrinking from the bad odours of ill kept prisons, she kept thinking of the sick souls that needed her and did not fail them. As often as she talked to them in chapel she found that what the prisoner needed most was not to be talked to, but *someone to talk to.* She would go from cell to cell, staying sometimes only a few minutes and at other times long hours, depending upon the prisoner's need of her. Sometimes the prisoner would tell her not to come in his cell, that he was in a bad mood and might hurt her, but she would go right ahead, thinking to herself: "In the first place, he is too cowardly to attack me; secondly, he hasn't the heart; thirdly, I know that God is my protector." In those days when prisoners were sent to Siberia she would accompany them as far as Viborg, where the final start was made.

Outside of Finland and Sweden she visited the prisons of England and Russia. She always wears a brooch with the words "Grace and Peace" it being her desire that from the first glance of the prisoner he would be arrested

by something that would speak to his condition. Her work has not only been in the prison walls, but every summer she makes long journeys into the lonely moorlands of the north and east, visiting discharged prisoners or bringing to the families of those still serving their sentence news and cheer. Her place in the lives of the condemned is instanced by her Christmas Letter of 1913, going into eight thousand homes. She has been a brave messenger of Christ and the record of her experiences, as told in this book, are full of tears and gladness. It is a wonderful story of a girl of sixteen years, giving her life to a most unpopular cause and producing results that have been marvelous in grace and peace. It is hoped that this book may have a wide reading in America.

THINKING THROUGH. Facts and Principles to Clarify the Controversial Thinking in the Church. By Alva Martin Kerr, D. D., Editor *The Herald of Gospel Liberty* (Doran, New York; 125 pages, $1.25). One of the best editorial writers on the religious press in America is Dr. Kerr. He has a clarity and vigor of style that commends his weekly output. This book is an appeal for soul thinking and a constructive religious programme. The subjects treated are "The Church and Science," "The Church and Evolution," "The Church the Interpreter," "The Supreme Test of Faith," "The Great Common Heresy," "Preach the Word," and "The Word Was Made Flesh." It is a middle-of-the-road argument for adjustment in the midst of the controversy of extremists. He pleads for the sincerity and worth of scientists and for the brotherly spirit on the part of Christians in their controversies with each other. Above all else is the need to incarnate Christ and make Him live again in us. Such is Dr. Kerr's climax in thinking through the controversial storm of these times. It is a word well said.

STUDIES IN THE FORGIVENESS OF SINS. By Jesse R. Kellems, D. D., LL. D., S. T. D. With Introduction by Jesse Caldwell, D. D., LL. D., Dean, Drake College of the Bible (Doran, New York; 224 pages, $2.00). The discussion of this theme is timely. There has always been much confusion in the various studies on forgiveness. These divergencies are almost as numerous as the denominations. Dr. Kellems discusses the relation of forgiveness to evangelism and the necessity of a study of the subject in the light of the tendencies in modern Christian thinking. He devotes a chapter each to the nature of forgiveness, its ground, its appropriation, baptism, and the Lord's Supper. Concerning the last two subjects, he maintains that baptism is an initiatory act based upon the authority of Jesus; it is likewise a symbolic, monumental, and confessional act, to which is attached the assurance of the forgiveness of sins. It is also a translational act, connected with the atonement as effect is with cause. It is a real act, baptism being the sacrament for the new birth. Also in the Lord's Supper he argues that forgiveness is related to it because it is connected with the blood of Christ. The

meaning of the Supper is related to our constant forgiveness. It is a time of heart examination, of the proclamation of the atonement, also bond of union among Christians. It is both a memorial and a sacrament. It is an interesting book, making a large place for the atonement and its significance in the world's reconciliation to God.

PUTTING ON IMMORTALITY. Reflections on the Life Beyond. By Clarence Edward Macartney, Minister of Arch Street Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia (Revell, New York; 189 pages, $1.50). This book is a call to reemphasize the hereafter, the author seeming to think there is too much emphasis on the present. There are ten chapters sweeping through the whole field of immortality, each chapter beginning with an appropriate poem. He argues from man's earliest longings, his pagan ideas, Old Testament ideas, and raises the question of the possibility of communion with the dead. He argues for the resurrection of the body, the resurrection of the unjust, between death and the resurrection, the last judgment, and future retribution. It is familiar ground to those who hold this position and it will give profitable reflection to those looking on the life beyond.

WHAT THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST STAND FOR. By William Robinson, M. A., B. Sc., Principal, Overdale College, Birmingham, England (Birmingham, Churches of Christ Publication Committee; 116 pages, 12 cents). This book is an interesting account of the British communion known as the Churches of Christ, being somewhat similar to the American communion known as Disciples of Christ. The British branch are very much more conservative and are close communionists, while the American Disciples had their origin in the practice of open communion. They have a similar theological approach, however, and it is unfortunate that they have not been more closely associated for the good of both. There are many fine people among these British churches, and Principal Robinson has done good service in preparing this little volume. He has also prepared a beautiful little book entitled *Holy Baptism and Holy Communion* (by the same publishers). He approaches these ordinances with reverence and surrounds them with the atmosphere of prayer. The ritual of both services is beautiful and helpful.

TREADING THE WINEPRESS. By Ralph Connor (Doran, New York; 394 pages, $2.00). The author of *The Sky Pilot* has written another novel almost as interesting as the one which gave him his fame.

Organizations for the Promotion of Christian Unity

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF CHRISTIAN UNITY, Inc. Having its inception in the Work of Thomas Campbell, a Presbyterian Minister of Washington, Pa., 1809; present organization, 1910. President, Levi G. Batman, Youngstown, Ohio; Secretary, Rev. H. C. Armstrong, 504 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore, Md., U. S. A. For intercessory prayer, friendly conferences, and distribution of irenic literature—"till we all attain unto the unity of the faith." Pentecost Sunday is the day named for special prayers for, and sermons on, Christian Unity in all Churches.

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF THE UNITY OF CHRISTENDOM, 1857. President, Athelstan Riley, Esq., 2 Kensington Court, London; Secretary in the United States, Rev. Calbraith Bourn Perry, Cambridge, N. Y. For intercessory prayer for the reunion of the Roman Catholic, Greek, and Anglican Communions.

CHRISTIAN UNITY ASSOCIATION OF SCOTLAND, 1903, Secretary, Rev. Robert W. Weir, Edinburgh. For maintaining, fostering, and expressing the consciousness of the underlying unity that is shared by many members of the different Churches in Scotland.

CHRISTIAN UNITY FOUNDATION, 1910. President, Rev. Nehemiah Boynton; Secretary, Rev. Linley V. Gordon, 70 Fifth Ave., New York City. For the promotion of Christian Unity throughout the world by research and conference.

CHURCHMAN'S UNION, 1898. President, Prof. Percy Gardner; Secretary, Rev. John H. Bentley, Souldern Rectory, Banbury, England. For cultivation of friendly relations between the Church of England and all other Christian Communions.

CONTINUATION COMMITTEE OF THE WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER, 1910. Chairman, Rt. Rev. Charles H. Brent; Secretariat, P. O. Box 226, Boston, Mass, U. S. A. For a world conference of all Christians relative to the unity of Christendom.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON ORGANIC UNION, 1918. Ad Interim Committee— Chairman, Rev. Joseph A. Vance, Detroit, Mich.; Secretary, Rev. Rufus W. Miller, Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia. For the organic union of the Evangelical Churches in the United States of America.

FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA, 1908. President, Dr. Robert E. Speer; Secretary, Rev. Charles S. Macfarland, 105 E. 22d St., New York. For the co-operation of the various Protestant Communions in service, rather than an attempt to unite upon definitions of theology and polity.

FREE CHURCH FELLOWSHIP, 1911. Rev. Malcolm Spencer, Bryn Melyn, Harrow Weald, Middlesex. For the cultivation of corporate prayer and thought for a new spiritual fellowship and communion with all branches of the Christian Church.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE EVANGELICAL FREE CRURCHES OF ENGLAND, 1895. President, Rev. H. Elvet Lewis, M. A., 37 Highbury, New Park, N. 5, London. Secretary, Rev. Thomas Nightingale, Memorial Hall, Farringdon Street, E. C. 4, London. For facilitating fraternal intercourse and co-operation among the Evangelical Free Churches in England.

UNIVERSAL CHRISTIAN CONFERENCE ON LIFE AND WORK, 1920. Chairmen, Archbishop of Upsala, Archbishop of Canterbury, Patriarch of Constantinople, and Rev. A. J Brown; Secretary, Rev. Henry A. Atkinson, 70 Fifth Ave., New York City. For union of the Churches in common, practical work, and to insist that the principles of the Gospel be applied to the solution of contemporary social and international problems.

WORLD ALLIANCE FOR PROMOTING INTERNATIONAL FRIENDSHIP THROUGH THE CHURCHES, 1914. Chairman, Most Rev. Randall Thomas Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury; Hon. Secretary, Rt. Hon. Sir Willoughby H. Dickinson, 41 Parliament St., London, S. W. 1; Chairman, American Council, Rev. William P. Merrill; General Secretary, Rev. Henry A. Atkinson, 70 Fifth Ave., New York City. For joint endeavour to achieve the promotion of international friendship through the Churches and the avoidance of war.

WORLD'S EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE, 1846; Incorporated 1912. Chairman, Sir Andrew Wingate; General Secretary, Henry Martyn Gooch, 19 Russell Sqr., London, W. C. 1. To enable Christians of British and foreign nations to realize in themselves, and to manifest to others, that living and essential union which binds together all believers in the fellowship of Christ. Universal Week of prayer organized by the Alliance since 1846.

PRINTED IN UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY THE
HESS PRINTING COMPANY
BALTIMORE, MD.

OL. XVI. No. 2 OCTOBER, 1926

"God gave unto us the Ministry of Reconciliation"

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

INTERDENOMINATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL

CONTENTS

The Editor's Notes:
The Tide Toward Unity—Three-fold Approach

The Aim and Scope of the World Conference . EDWARD L. PARSONS

Recent Conferences Between the Church of England and the Free Churches . . . . . ALFRED E. GARVIE

Issues Relating to Faith . . . . . B. ALFRED DUMM

Issues Relating to Order and Polity . . . . FRANK K. SANDERS

Realism in Conference . . . . . ROBERT A. ASHWORTH

The Challenge of a Pilgrim Faith . . . . R. EDIS FAIRBAIRN

The Faith and Mystery of Conference . . . . HERBERT KELLY

Missionary Aspect of Doctrinal Unity . . . JOHN J. BANNINGA

What People and Papers are Saying
The Need of Unity—Not Enough to Desire Union; One Must Work For It—Faith and Order—Proposals for Unity in India—The Unity Movement in India as Seen by an Episcopal Editor—Protestant Orders and Sacraments—Last Letters of Cardinal Mercier to Archbishop of Canterbury—Religion and World Unity—If Leaders Were as Courageous as They Are Conservative

Book Reviews
The Confusion of the Churches—The One Body and the One Spirit—The Church of the Spirit—Anglicanism, an Introduction to Its History and Philosophy—A Statement Covering Ordination to the Ministry, Issued by the United Church of Canada—Shall We Have a Creed?—Foundations of Faith

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY, Inc.
504 N. FULTON AVE., BALTIMORE, MD., U. S. A.
AGENTS:
Fleming H. Revell Company, New York
Maruzen Company, Ltd., Tokyo, Osaka, Kyoto, Fukuoka and Sendai

CONTENTS

OCTOBER, 1926

VOL. XVI. No. 2

THE EDITOR'S NOTES 117

THE AIM AND SCOPE OF THE WORLD CONFERENCE.....EDWARD L. PARSONS 119

RECENT CONFERENCES BETWEEN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND THE FREE CHURCHES.....ALFRED E. GARVIE 127

ISSUES RELATING TO FAITH.....B. ALFRED DUMM 139

ISSUES RELATING TO ORDER AND POLITY.....FRANK K. SANDERS 148

REALISM IN CONFERENCE...ROBERT A. ASHWORTH 156

THE CHALLENGE OF A PIGRIM FAITH.....R. EDIS FAIRBAIRN 163

THE FAITH AND MYSTERY OF CONFERENCE.....HERBERT KELLY 170

MISSIONARY ASPECT OF DOCTRINAL UNITY.....JOHN J. BANNINGA 176

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY 183

BOOK REVIEWS 213

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

504 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore, Md., U. S. A.

CONTRIBUTED ARTICLES:—THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY is open to contributions from all Christians—Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Protestant, and all other Christians who accept Jesus as Lord and Saviour. It is entirely immaterial whether these contributions agree or disagree with the Editor's position, or the position of any contributor. We are seeking to bring together those who differ, for unless we frankly face our differences, and think them through, we shall never agree. THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY welcomes to its Forum all Ministers of Reconciliation.

PRICE:—The price of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY, published in January, April, July, and October, is seventy-five cents a single copy, or two dollars and fifty cents a year, in the United States and all parts of the world. A local church of any communion contributing annually $5.00 or more to THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY EXTENSION FUND will be entitled to receive two copies of THE QUARTERLY free for one year—one copy going to the minister and the other copy to some designated person or institution.

Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office at Baltimore, Md.

A Statement

THIS journal is the organ of no party other than those, growing up in all parties, who are interested in the Unity of the Church of Christ. Its pages are free to all indications of Christian Unity and Ventures of Faith. It maintains that, whether so accepted or not, all Christians—Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Protestant, and all others who accept Jesus as Lord and Saviour—are parts of the Church of Christ and that their Equality before God is the paramount issue of modern times.

Such a journal must, necessarily, be unofficial in its attempt to be an Interpreter of the mind of the churches and in furnishing a Forum for better understanding and cordial appreciation between the divided, and sometimes far isolated, communions of Christendom. It, thereby, seeks to contribute something to clear the way to the Altar of Reconciliation.

It does not hold itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors, except in a very general way as to their character and general attitude; but it invites to its pages such contributions of thought as will, on one hand, help in the removal of misunderstandings, and, on the other, create an atmosphere where our differences may be frankly faced and freely discussed in Christian Fellowship.

All contributors are allowed the same freedom in the expression of their thoughts, as the Editor exercises for himself. He does not anticipate that others will always approve his thoughts, any more than he presumes to assume responsibility for the thoughts of others; but every writer is responsible for what appears above his own name. We are to be free to think and equally free to let think, until, in corporate thinking and corporate praying, we find the Road to Brotherhood.

Consequently, this journal is not only not the organ of any party in Christendom; but, likewise, it is not the exponent of any theory of Christian Unity. It follows the reality in personal experience of spiritual growth in Christ—growing up in Him and toward other Christians as we find the Truth, which shall free us from suspicion, prejudice, pride, and unlove. Then we shall be able to interpret Christ in those terms which He expressed in his own words,—"By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have Love one to another."

The Christian Union Quarterly

Edited by Peter Ainslie, D. D.

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

Dr. Hamilcar Alivisatos,
Athens, Greece.

Bishop Charles P. Anderson,
Chicago, Ill.

Rev. Nehemiah Boynton, D.D.,
New York, N. Y.

Bishop Charles H. Brent,
Buffalo, N. Y.

Dean Charles R. Brown,
New Haven, Conn.

Prof. William Adams Brown,
New York, N. Y.

Rev. Raymond Calkins, D.D.,
Cambridge, Mass.

Bishop James Cannon, Jr.,
Washington, D. C.

Prof. Dr. J. Eugene Choisy,
Geneva, Switzerland.

Rev. S. D. Chown, D.D.,
Toronto, Canada.

Dr. Francis E. Clark,
Boston, Mass.

Dr. J. A. Cramer,
Utrecht, Holland.

Prof. Dr. Adolf Deissmann,
Berlin, Germany.

Rev. A. W. Fortune, D.D.,
Lexington, Kentucky

Dean H. E. W. Fosbroke,
New York, N. Y.

Dean W. E. Garrison,
Chicago, Ill.

Principal Alfred E. Garvie,
London, England.

Most Rev. Metropolitan Germanos,
Thyatira, Asia Minor.

President W. A. Harper,
Elon College, N. C.

Dr. Henry T. Hodgkin,
Shanghai, China.

Rev. Finis S. Idleman, D.D.,
New York, N. Y.

Dean W. R. Inge,
London, England.

Prof. Rufus M. Jones,
Haverford, Pa.

Bishop Edwin S. Lines,
Newark, N. J.

Dr. Frederick Lynch,
New York, N. Y.

Very Rev. J. A. M'Clymont, D.D.,
Edinburgh, Scotland.

Prof. Samuel McComb,
Cambridge, Mass.

Bishop Francis J. McConnell,
Pittsburgh, Pa.

Bishop William F. McDowell,
Washington, D. C.

The Bishop of Manchester,
Manchester, England.

Rev. William P. Merrill, D.D.,
New York, N. Y.

Dr. Wilfred Monod,
Paris, France.

Dr. C. C. Morrison,
Chicago, Ill.

Dr. John R. Mott,
New York, N. Y.

Bishop Harald Ostenfeld,
Copenhagen, Denmark.

Bishop Edward L. Parsons,
San Francisco, Calif.

Prof. Arthur S. Peake,
Manchester, England.

President George W. Richards,
Lancaster, Pa.

Principal W. B. Selbie,
Oxford, England.

Rev. J. H. Shakespeare, D.D.,
London, England.

Pastor Dr. Friedrich Siegmund-Schultze,
Berlin, Germany.

Dr. Robert E. Speer,
New York, N. Y.

The Archbishop of Upsala,
Upsala, Sweden.

Dr. Henry van Dyke,
Princeton, N. J.

Rev. Joseph A. Vance, D.D.,
Detroit, Mich.

Bishop Boyd Vincent,
Cincinnati, Ohio.

Bishop Luther B. Wilson,
New York, N. Y.

The Path of Faith and Penitence

FRANKLY, I AM NOT AT ALL CONVINCED THAT THE WAY TO ULTIMATE REUNION LIES THROUGH ARGUMENT AND HISTORICAL APPEAL. OF COURSE, BOTH THESE METHODS MUST BE USED. BUT THE COMING TOGETHER FOR THE PURPOSE OF STATING OUR MUTUAL POSITION, AND THE ENCOURAGING AND MAINTAINING OF "FRATERNAL" RELATIONS, ARE LEADING ON TO THE DAWN OF THE DAY FOR WHICH ALL MEN OF GOOD-WILL ARE PRAYING, WHEN THE TATTERED ROBE SHALL BE ONCE MORE OF A PIECE. WE MUST HAVE PLENTY OF FAITH AND PATIENCE.

—THOMAS WILLIAM COOK,
Bishop of Lewes, England.

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

OCTOBER, 1926

THE EDITOR'S NOTES

The Tide Toward Unity

THE indications are that the tendency of Christianity to divide has about spent itself. This is not saying that there will never be any additional divisions. There still may be divisions and, in some quarters, it looks as though there will be, but the indications are that they will be inconsequential in comparison with the divisions of the past. The tides undoubtedly are turning toward unity,—strong, deep, universal,—and are as mysterious as Christianity itself.

There is no branch in Christendom but in its fellowship may be found outspoken witnesses for a united Christendom. This attitude of mind has never before been so universal in the entire history of Christianity. On the continent of Europe, until recently, there was the voice of Cardinal Mercier for the Roman Catholics, and now there are the voices of Archbishop Germanos for the Eastern Orthodox Churches and Archbishop Söderblom for the Protestants. In England there is the Anglican Conference at Lambeth in 1920 and the response from the British Free Churches. Canada's adventure toward unity surpasses all attempts in modern times and presents a really united Church of Canada, where formerly were Methodists, Congregationalists, and Presbyterians. In the United States there are constant discussions of the subject, in which leaders of all communions share. On the mission fields the pronouncement toward unity is so strong that, but for many of the churches which are supporting mission stations, the native Christians would lead a movement for the union of all Christian forces in their respective fields. The Christian mind of the world is coming to think in terms of unity rather than in terms of division, which has characterized it through the centuries. These are the triumphs of Christianity.

Three-fold Approach

The Christian unity movement has taken various forms, all of which are contributing to the ideal of a united Christen-

dom. Federation arose among Protestants in America in 1908. It has not only made rapid progress in bringing into co-operation the Protestant churches in the United States in service, rather than an attempt to unite upon definitions of theology and polity, but it has sent its influence around the world wherever there are communities of Protestants. One of the normal steps in the progress of Christianity is the unifying of those groups that are of nearest kin. Federation is doing this for Protestantism.

Last year the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work at Stockholm emphasized the ethical interpretation of Christianity and brought into its co-operation a majority of Christendom, the only large communion not co-operating being the Roman Catholic Church, which was invited, but declined the invitation, to our regret.

As important as are the social and ethical interpretations of Christianity, no permanent progress can be made in Christian unity without some theological understanding. This is the most delicate and difficult of the three approaches, but the World Conference on Faith and Order had its beginning in 1910 to meet this need. It has already held several conferences to confer relative to the possibilities of a theological unity. Next year it proposes to hold another world conference on Faith and Order—dealing with the expression of a living faith and the office of the ministry. As wide apart as Christians are now in the discussion of these problems, it is surprising how much common ground there is from which to begin such a conference. The understanding that has come out of previous conferences, the preparation for this conference, and the friendly atmosphere of these times contribute mightily to a worth while gathering.

In consequence of its importance, as well as its possibility, this number of *The Christian Union Quarterly* is devoted entirely to the interest of the World Conference on Faith and Order. These editorial notes attempt to be only an introductory and sympathetic word to many who eagerly contribute their thoughts to the Lausanne Conference of 1927.

PETER AINSLIE.

THE AIM AND SCOPE OF THE WORLD CONFERENCE

BY EDWARD L. PARSONS, D.D.
Bishop of California, San Francisco, Cal.

THE World Conference is an adventure in idealism. It is, likewise, a thoroughly realistic project. It is guided by the ideal of the unity of Christ's Church, but in thoroughly realistic fashion it proposes to move toward that ideal by facing frankly and fully the present situation and the difficulties which have to be overcome. Indeed it was to bring these difficulties into the open that the Conference came into being. As is well known, Bishop Brent, commenting on the Edinburgh Missionary Conference of 1910, at the General Convention of the Episcopal Church shortly after, noted that if we are to move toward unity we must stop ignoring the big essential doctrines which were ignored at Edinburgh. We must face them and try to understand them. It was from that suggestion that the movement looking to the World Conference grew and it is in that endeavour to get at the actual facts in the whole unity problem that the World Conference has its reason for existence.

The significance of such an undertaking can hardly be overestimated. With the single exception of the Church of Rome, a great and sad exception, every major Christian communion will be represented at Lausanne. These various communions are meeting under the conviction that they have in some way through their disunity failed in their duty as Christians. They meet under acknowledgment of the guilt of schism. They know that Christ should not be divided. But they do not know where chiefly each is responsible for the state of division and its perpetuation. They know much of the history of schisms but little of the present significance of the causes which led to them. They

propose, therefore, to explore the whole range of divisive questions, to discover, if possible, the fields of agreement and the points at which division arises, to map out at least some of the stages of the path toward reunion. They are engineers of unity.

In other words, the Christian churches propose to face, for the first time since the great disruption of the sixteenth century, the whole problem of their relations with one another, surveying the humiliating reality in the light of the ideal. Unless one would except the abortive attempts in the fifteenth century to heal the schism between East and West, there is absolutely no precedent for such an undertaking. The great councils of the past which have dealt with doctrinal matters have met under the pressure of immediate crises and have had to reach immediate decisions. They have, for the most part, represented the effort of a dominant party to deal with a refractory minority. They have been the battle ground (the word is only too accurate) of parties within the Church. They have not been the free conference of groups each of which regards itself as autonomous and historically legitimate. Lausanne is unprecedented in this free character of its membership, in the complexity of its problems, and in the acknowledgment, without fixing the guilt upon the "other party," of the wrong of the present situation.

And each item in the significance of the Conference points directly to that which is most significant and most unprecedented of all — the spirit of Christian love and conciliation which has guided all the preparation and which, it is assumed, will guide all the deliberations of the gathering. There is nothing new to say about the spirit in which Christian theologians and Christian communions have so commonly gone about the business of settling their differences. They have, with horrid frequency, fought them out with hatred as a spur. They have rarely thought them out with love as a guide. It is precisely this latter thing which the World Conference proposes to do. It proposes to substitute love for hatred, the spirit of conciliation for that which seeks victory. It proposes to test

the almost untried method of conference in the faith that, if honestly tried, it will lead to constructive results.

It is, I think, most essential in attempting to appraise what may come through such conference that we should realize the essential newness of the undertaking. The unprecedented scale and spirit of it constitute one of the factors which must be reckoned with. The whole affair is experimental, tentative. For fifteen years men have been thinking about it and year by year changes have come in emphasis and horizon. As one illustration, there is to-day less emphasis on the presentation of "denominational" points of view, more on the big subjects which lie in the center. As another, I would venture the guess that every leader in the movement has far more appreciation of the difficulties in the way of reunion than he had ten years ago; but, at the same time, far more faith in the power of the common loyalty to Christ.

Whether those particular illustrations hold or not it cannot be doubted that the whole business of the Conference is as tentative and experimental as it is unprecedented. That, however, does not mean in any way whatever that the Conference is like a crew of adventurers embarking upon an unknown sea. The invitation to the Conference states that the common faith in Christ which binds the members is the historic faith in the Incarnation. The Conference starts from Nicea. The Christology of the Church is taken for granted; the doctrine of the Triune God will lie back of all discussion. The questions which the Conference has to discuss have to do with the Church as the means by which God in Christ is to reconcile the world to Himself. But the whole "adventure" is undertaken under the captaincy of the Incarnate Christ.

Nor is it like sailing to an unknown goal. The harbour, if one may press the figure a little, is the unity of the Church. There is no question about that. No one comes to the Conference who does not believe that such unity is Our Lord's will. The sea has to be charted. That is the business of the Conference—to find the rocks and reefs, and the deep safe channels.

In the light of the Incarnation and of the ideal of the Church as Christ's Body, the various doctrines which concern the character and function of the Church and which are the divisive "faiths" have to come under consideration.

But, it has constantly been objected, when these doctrines come under review and into conference, what is to be the result? Apparently the most definite answer which many have given has been the declaration of faith that in some way the mere fact of conference is going to get us ahead. I believe that that is altogether true. The symbolic and imaginative value of such an unprecedented gathering is enormous. But all the years of preparation have surely brought us to a point where we may confidently expect more than that. Even one who has watched the preparations chiefly from the outside sees definite possibilities emerging. It is understood that the free discussion of the series of topics set forth by the Subjects Committee is intended to elicit not every individual shade of opinion upon them but, so far as may be, the presentation of the larger typical interpretations represented in the various communions. Nothing is to be glossed over in the interest of good feeling, because the Conference is useless unless the good feeling behind is sufficient to give ready and sympathetic hearing to the "other party." The Orthodox Catholic does not come to convince others that he is right; nor does the most individualistic Protestant. Each comes to learn what is of value to the other and to help the other to understand what is of value to him.

Now out of such understanding, two things should emerge. On the one hand, there should be a growing appreciation on the part of each group of the meaning of Christianity and the Church to the other groups, and, on the other hand, as part of the same process, a clearer vision of the things which cannot be swept away merely by an outpouring of good-will. Few, perhaps, would halt the progress of unity for a matter of ritual, the literal interpretation in detail of an ancient creed, a method of baptism, a specific doctrine of the priesthood. Good-will makes a new perspective; but, nevertheless, it does

not level the mountains. There are some things which seem so vital to special groups that they constitute irreducible *minima,* a place for which must be found in the reunited Church. One sees, for example, the two great historic types of religious experience, those which we know to-day as Catholic and Protestant; but which are, I take it, quite universal both within and without Christianity—one sees, I say, these two great types gradually unfolding their fundamental convictions and challenging the intelligence and love of the leaders to find a way to bring them to live together without sacrifice of the value of either.

In answering that challenge, there must begin that process which Mr. Ralph Brown has happily called "concerted evolution." The World Conference really believes in the guidance of the Holy Spirit, really believes that the Spirit of truth will guide humble seekers after truth into a constantly larger understanding of God.

Evolution in this case, of course, does not mean that the Conference will trust itself to some natural and inevitable process of improvement, such as, in those innocent days of the nineties, under the influence of Spencer, we all thought was rapidly bringing the millenium. It means that its members will surrender the best that is in them of mind and soul to the guidance of the Holy Spirit, intelligently and consistently, and courageously ready to do God's will. Nor does evolution, as used in this case, mean, as so easily it may be misinterpreted to mean, that truth is an evolving thing. It means that the Conference must recognize what every Christian scholar to-day knows, that there has been a constant "development" of doctrine since the beginning, a development sometimes tending to obscure the deeper truth, but always in touch with the needs of the age and attempting to adjust itself to those needs. This development of doctrine is discovery of God in growing measure. It does not negative, it does not repudiate the "faith of our fathers." It starts from it and moves out to wider applications of it. The World Conference must believe that revela-

tion never stops, that there are infinite reaches of God's revelations to men as yet unfathomed, that, therefore, even the largest measure of truth held by any one communion cannot be all. Believing thus, its members humbly gather and in fellowship seek wider knowledge.

Two comments may be made on such an attitude. It may be noted that it is in full accord with the best thinking of our own time. We have learned that life is not an affair of logic, that we do not live by the application of carefully wrought intellectual systems. We live first. Thinking, loving, doing are all part of the very complex life process. Most of our doctrine, in economics, politics, religion, is the rationalizing of the position in which the total personality finds itself. Discovering the truth is not a purely intellectual process. It consists in thinking our best about the best which life offers us. In other words, to see the truth of the doctrine of the Church or the sacraments or the ministry no better *milieu* can be provided than the meeting of many divergent views under the tremendous power of a corporate purpose. If ever hearts are to lie open, if ever minds are to be clear for God to have his way and Our Lord's will to be fulfilled, it would be under such conditions.

And again it is to be noted that that is but saying in other words what Our Lord tells us when He declares that those who will to do God's will are those who have the key to his teaching. Humility, teachableness, trust in others, sympathy and understanding of what seems totally alien, the readiness to study values without prejudice, are the moral prerequisites for the knowledge of God's truth. A communion which proclaims, as probably all have at one time or another proclaimed, "We have nothing to offer save our own uncompromising position," is by so much cut off from God and by so much denies the fulness of Our Lord's Incarnation in humanity. We need to pray that such a spirit be banished from the Conference and that its members come with honest conviction of their corporate need of larger vision.

Finally, one asks, is it possible to forecast in any way the direction of this concerted purposive doctrinal evolution? If one again may guess (for none would venture to prophesy) it would seem as if it must come in the direction of a clearer understanding of the comprehensiveness of the Church, a matter of emphasis and perspective. Schisms have usually come through the unwillingness of the dominant party, or of both parties, to recognize the elements of value in the other view. One holds a yardstick; another a meter-tape; and each cries "My way is the only way to measure the Christian world." When schism results and differences are fixed and loyalties grow strong, it becomes difficult to transcend the barriers. But when, as at the World Conference, men come determined to transcend them, determined to admit that others holding views radically different from theirs are equally loyal to Christ and equally intelligent and learned, what is going to happen about the irreducible *minima* of which I have already spoken? Two things obviously! On the one hand, each will search his own system to see where it can open to admit fuller recognition of what his brother values as so essential; on the other hand, each must come to modify his own view of what is essential. The former is comparatively easy. The Catholic, for example, may easily come to believe that there is space in his system for all that Protestantism means. The latter is more than hard. Yet, after all, what must an Orthodox or Anglican Catholic do when faced by the majestic spiritual achievements and profound Christian insights of Protestantism? The ordinary theological categories under which he has classified it fail altogether to meet the need. They have little reality where men trust and respect one another. They call for reinterpretation. Precisely the same experience must stir the most extreme Protestant as he comes, under the spell of fellowship and seeking the guidance of the Holy Spirit, to face the vast wealth of Christian life, treasured and nourished and brought to fine fruit, in the ancient communions whose representatives sit beside him. These several communions, gathered for conference, represent each a big fact

in Christian history; but it now becomes clear (so we pray) that they represent also each a real thing in the sight of God. The search then begins for a place for the values of each group in the life of the whole. Men cannot always ignore reality. They must yield ultimately to its logic. Indeed one might be tempted to say that the entire scope of the World Conference is defined as the attempt to bring theological formulæ to the test of reality as it is discovered in universal Christian experience.

Such work is no light task. It has been no part of this article to touch upon the methods by which this task can best be done. But, in any case, they are sure to be in their turn experimental and tentative. The work will call for the noblest patience as well as the clearest thinking. It will put a heavy strain upon the resources of Christian love. It will test to the utmost the capacity of Christian men for great vision, but, still more, their capacity to deal greatly with little things. If any number of men can go through that ordeal in good temper and unbroken fellowship, they must emerge with a vastly richer conception of the Church and with some understanding of how that conception can be related to the facts of a divided Christendom. If they do, the Conference will have justified itself. Some part of the pathway toward reunion will have been marked by these engineers of unity.

EDWARD L. PARSONS.

RECENT CONFERENCES BETWEEN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND THE FREE CHURCHES*

BY PRINCIPAL ALFRED E. GARVIE, M.A., D.D.
New College, Hampstead, London

It may be assumed that there is a general desire for a more manifest unity of the Christian churches, a unity which will not be only as spiritual an object of faith, but will also give evidence of itself to the world in common witness, work, and worship, especially in the common celebration of the Supper of the Lord, the most sacred symbol and valuable channel of Christian fellowship. While English Nonconformists generally have no difficulty about such co-operation and communion, the difficulty lies in the Anglican Church, which does not approve, and claims that its principles forbid its approving, the celebration of the Eucharist in an episcopalian church by any minister not episcopally ordained. The immediate purpose is neither a federation in common witness and work without common worship, on the one hand, nor a uniformity of organization in an absolute corporate unity, on the other, but variety in unity, *i.e.*, the preservation of their distinctive features by the different communions within, and as far as consistent with, the manifestation of unity to the world in a common ministry, and common sacraments. What is intended is not absorption of all other communions in one; but the contribution of each to enrich a wider fellowship without loss of any spiritual values now enjoyed in the narrower. Congregationalists could continue to be Congregationalists and Baptists, Baptists, except in so far as the common ministry and common sacraments would

* *The Church of England and the Free Churches. Proceedings of Joint Conferences held at Lambeth Palace,* 1921-1925, edited by G. K. A. Bell and W. L. Robertson. Oxford University Press.

demand some modifications in the practical application of their principles without the abandonment of these principles.

(1) The Lambeth "Appeal to all Christian People" of 1920 suggested a method by which, from the standpoint of Anglicanism, the difficulty might be dealt with, and the desired unity be realized. It was imperative that the Free Churches should make a worthy response to an appeal so sincere and earnest. It was decided that, in the first instance, the response of the Free Churches represented on the Federal Council should be made through it; but the appointment of each person nominated by the Federal Council on the committee charged with this duty was confirmed by his own denomination. There have been no negotiations committing either the Federal Council or the churches. There have been only conferences, exploring the possibilities of the situation. The question discussed has been, what conditions must be fulfilled, if the proposed unity is to be realized. The results have, from time to time, been reported to the Federal Council, and through it to the denominations represented, without committing either it or them to acceptance or approval. The conferences have now for a time been brought to a close, in order that the churches may have full opportunity to study and seek God's guidance regarding the conclusions which have been reached as a result of this exploration of the possibilities of the situation.

(2) It would be a mistake and a wrong if a premature judgment were offered on so protracted labours of the representatives of the churches. The Church of England can take no further steps until another conference of Anglican bishops is held at Lambeth, when the situation will probably be considerably modified from what it was at the last conference by what is now taking place in the mission field, notably India and China. No immediate reply is, or can be expected, from the Free Churches, as the matter is one that demands their careful, and most of all, prayerful consideration, that the mind and will of the Head of the Church may be learned in all humility, and done with all fidelity. The booklet entitled *The Church of England and the Free Churches,* published by the Oxford

University Press, contains the record of the *Proceedings of Joint Conferences held at Lambeth Palace* 1921-1925. This record deserves study; but some guidance from one who has taken part in all these proceedings may be helpful, and for this reason I venture to submit this statement.

I. We may begin with questions on which, after discussions, closer agreement has been reached.

1. In the Lambeth Appeal membership in the Universal Church of Christ was limited to *baptized believers* (p. 1). In the statement on the nature of the Church this restriction is removed and it is stated that "this one Church consists of all those who have been or are being redeemed by and in Christ" (p. 34). Thus neither Quakers nor adherents of Baptist churches who have not yet been baptized are excluded. What is said about the observance of the two sacraments ordained by Christ Himself may exclude Quakers from the organization of the common ministry and the common sacraments; but by their very principles they do not seek any such inclusion. Nothing is laid down as to the subjects or modes of baptism that would exclude the Baptists. The ample liberty promised (pp. 3 and 25) would extend to their practice.

2. In the Lambeth Appeal the term, offensive to many Nonconformists, "bodies" is not used; what is used is the word "communions." The claim to be "churches" made in the Response (p. 15) was not challenged; and afterwards the word was freely used. There is a statement of particular interest to Congregationalists. "The true relation of the Church and local churches is that which is described in the New Testament—namely, that the churches are the local representatives of the One Church" (p. 35).

3. The Anglican members further recognized that these churches had a *ministry of the word and sacraments within the universal Church.* The ministries which they have in view are thus described: "ministries which rest upon a long-established Order, which have been conferred by some solemn and authoritative act implying ordination to the ministry of the universal Church, and not merely commissions to ministry of a particu-

lar denomination, and which are regarded as involving a life-long vocation" (p. 45). "We regard them as being within their several spheres real ministries in the universal Church." Again, "It seems to us to be in accordance with the Lambeth Appeal to say, as we are prepared to say, that the ministries which we have in view in this memorandum, ministries which imply a sincere intention to preach Christ's word and administer the sacraments as Christ has ordained, and to which authority so to do has been solemnly given by the church concerned, are real ministries of Christ's word and sacraments in the universal Church" (p 46). Subsequently there was a qualification of this statement which to the Free Church representatives seemed a logical inconsistency. "In our judgment, say the Anglican representatives, "it does not follow that because certain ministries are admitted to be real ministries of Christ's word and sacraments, they must thereby be considered as in themselves sufficient" (p. 68). Here lies the *crux* of the whole matter; and to this we must return after consideration of the position regarding the episcopate.

II. There was general agreement among those who took part in the conferences that the possibility of any reunion of the kind contemplated depended on the practical acceptance of the episcopate as an element in the polity of the church of the future, and, as a consequence, that the ordination of all ministries after reunion had taken place would involve the presence of a bishop along with the presbyters and representatives of the congregation. It was made clear, however, by the Free Church representatives that this did not commit them to the acceptance of any theory about the episcopate being essential to the existence of the Church; and this reservation had the assent of the Anglican representatives (see p. 37). The Free Church representatives were fully aware, and made it quite plain, that they could not claim the support of all their brethren in this conclusion, the reasons for which and the consequences of which, therefore, must be fully stated.

1. The Lambeth Appeal does not, as did the previous Quadrilateral, include the historic episcopate, especially as an

essential condition of the visible unity of the Church. It does, however, include in these conditions "a ministry acknowledged in every part of the Church as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit, but also the commission of Christ, and the authority of the whole Body" (p. 3), and it does insist, and regards it as a reasonable claim, "that the episcopate is the one means of providing such a ministry" (p. 4). The Reply of the Free Churches states that, as no form of polity is essential, or has been prescribed by the Lord, they "have an open mind towards episcopal Order as towards any other," but "cannot be expected to consider any form of polity which claims to be an exclusive channel of grace, or which fails to recognize the place and the rights of the Christian people in the affairs of the Church" (p. 21). In the Report on the Ministry agreement was reached in the following terms: "For the allaying of doubts and scruples in the future, and for the more perfect realization of the truth that the ministry is a ministry of the Church, and not merely of any part thereof, means should be provided for the united Church, which we desire, whereby its ministry may be acknowledged by every part thereof as possessing the authority of the whole Body. In view of the fact that the episcopate was from early times and for many centuries accepted, and by the greater part of Christendom is still accepted, as the means whereby this authority of the whole Body is given, we agree that it ought to be accepted as such for the united Church of the future. Similarly, in view of the place which the council of presbyters and the congregation of the faithful had in the constitution of the early Church, and the preservation of these elements of presbyteral and congregational Order in large sections of Christendom, we agree that they should be maintained with a representative and constitutional episcopate as permanent elements in the Order and Life of the united Church" (p. 37). The reasons for acceptance of the episcopate may be summarized: (1) No form of polity is essential, or has been prescribed by the Lord. (2) The episcopate has been from early times, and is still, accepted by the greater part of Christen-

dom. (3) The elements of presbyteral and congregational Order are to be conjoined with it. (4) The episcopate is to be representative and constitutional. May I add my own conviction; that, as in God's providence the Church in its history has not been without the guidance of his Spirit, these types of polity have emerged, not only to meet historical necessities, but also to express complementary aspects of the unity of the Church as a visible organization, more effective in their combination than any could be in its isolation, for the fulfilment of the Church's tasks in the world.

2. In a Memorandum prepared in answer to a question of the Federal Council the term "representative and constitutional episcopate" was defined. "The phrase 'representative and constitutional episcopate' we take to mean an episcopate which is exercised not apart from but in conjunction with other forms of ecclesiastical authority, and especially the authority resident in the presbyterate, and the yet larger and more fundamental authority that resides in the Church as a whole as guided by the Spirit of God. We agree in holding that Christ as living Head of the Church has given an authority to those jointly and not in isolation one from another. The records of the early Church, and especially the Acts of the Apostles, show us this in the working; and it is a recovery of co-operation in fuller measure between the episcopate, the presbyterate, and the Body of the faithful that the Lambeth Appeal wished to see" (p. 58). Details are given in this Memorandum as to the way in which such an episcopate is exercised in Anglican churches outside of England, where the establishment of the church makes so great a difference. For instance, "in choosing candidates for the ministry he (the bishop) must take the call of the church into account, and in ordaining priests he acts with the presbytery (59). "The congregation is not debarred by any principle in the Anglican system from appointing its own ministers. . . . But there is reserved to the bishop or his deputy the right to institute to a cure of souls" (p. 60). On this Report the Federal Council gave this judgment: "The Council appreciates the

agreement in the Report that any polity possible for a united Church must combine episcopal, presbyteral, and congregational elements, and further the recognition of the 'Church' as the seat of 'the larger and more fundamental authority' " (p. 61). In this statement, however, there lurks an ambiguity. The Anglican statement used *Church* with capital *c* as equivalent to the Body of the Faithful; this seems to use *church* without the capital for local congregation; and here surely the Anglican view is right.

3. The Council also asked for a "further elucidation" of the way in which "the congregational elements" could be recognized (p. 62). The answer to this question is found in the Memorandum prepared by the Bishop of Truro and myself, but "generally approved by the Joint Conference, June 19, 1925" (p. 76). I am myself convinced that all that really matters, the preaching of the Gospel, the administration of the sacraments, and the discipline of the membership—the three essential functions of the Church, according to the Protestant Confessions,—can be conserved. No more restriction on liberty need be involved than there now is in the association of Congregational churches with one another, when their obligations to one another are loyally observed, for liberty of caprice must not be confounded with liberty of conscience, "the organization of the different denominational units in their one common denomination need not differ, we suppose, from what already exists, except in so far as it is modified by the acceptance of the Terms of Union" (p. 81). Some functions would be reserved for the bishop, "notably ordination, and probably confirmation" (p. 82), although nowhere is it insisted that confirmation should be general. No change could be made by the central legislative council by a mere majority vote. "The constituent churches, as well as each House—bishops, clergy, and laity—should vote separately" (p. 80). These are but tentative indications of how far each denomination would retain what it is pleased to retain, and how far it would be from any coercion to adopt any practice it disapproved. In all the discussions what has emerged is

that only as regards ordination and the celebration of the Eucharist would any uniformity be insisted on.

4. The object of reunion for the Anglicans was to secure a universally recognized ministry, which would make possible a common celebration of the Eucharist, in which, without doubt or scruple, all Christians could share. "We eagerly look forward," says the Lambeth Appeal, "to the day when through its acceptance in a united Church we may all share in that grace which is pledged to the members of the whole Body in the apostolic rite of the laying on of hands, and in the joy and fellowship of a Eucharist in which as one family we may together, without any doubtfulness of mind, offer to the one Lord our worship and service" (p. 4). The Free Church representatives gave unqualified assent to the desire for a ministry of the united Church "acknowledged by every part thereof as possessing the authority of the whole Body." The qualification to which the Anglicans agreed reads as follows: "The acceptance of episcopal ordination for the future would not imply the acceptance of any particular theory as to its origin or character, or the disowning of past ministries of word and sacraments otherwise received, which have, together with those received by episcopal ordination, been used and blessed by the Spirit of God" (p. 37). They have not accepted, nor have they been asked or understood to accept, any view that the sacrament is not valid unless celebrated by an episcopally ordained minister. No compromise of principle would be involved in the concession in practice. If in the church of the future, the three types of polity—episcopal, presbyteral, and congregational—are to be conjoined "as permanent elements in the Order and Life of the united Church," it would be unreasonable and arbitrary to claim that in ordination there should be liberty to exclude that one element, which is for Anglicans of primary importance, as the Congregational is for Congregationalists. Its indispensableness is not to be proved by appeal to ecclesiastical tradition, nor can it be insisted on by "way of mutual deference to one another's consciences" (p. 23), although it might for such a reason be freely conceded. It

may, however, be accepted without scruple on the ground that it is desirable that the united Church should seek in its polity to harmonize these different types which have emerged in the history of the Church.

5. To admit that episcopal ordination should be the rule in the united Church, in the polity of which the episcopal is one of the elements, if in that ordinance the two other elements are conjoined with it, as the Anglican representatives agree that they should be (p. 49), is a measure of practical expediency, nay more, a symbol of harmonized differences. It is something altogether different, however, to hope, as the Lambeth Appeal does, that ministers already ordained should "accept a commission through episcopal ordination as obtaining for them a ministry throughout the whole fellowship" (p. 5). From the outset the Free Church representatives declared the impossibility of such a concession, and insisted on the distinction between ordination and authorization or license (to use the Presbyterian term). "Ordination," they said, "to minister Christ's word and sacraments is a general thing to be given once for all; license to exercise it in any district or communion is a particular thing which may of course, be extended" (p. 22). They maintained that ordination is to the ministry of the One Church of Christ, and not to that of any one denomination; they admitted that there would be need of mutual authorization, authority to exercise that ministry in this or that communion. The Anglican brethren have, as has already been mentioned, qualified their recognition of Nonconformist ministries; while admitted "real" they are regarded as not "in themselves sufficient" (p. 68). Anglicans are prepared to admit to equal status in the united Church even non-episcopally ordained ministers in all respects, except the right to celebrate the Eucharist in an episcopal church (p. 80). Authority for this can be conferred in their view only by episcopal ordination. To meet the difficulty they suggest these alternatives, either "solemn authorization by the laying on of hands by a bishop," which, however, they do not favour, or "ordination *sub conditione*" which they approve, but

cannot promise would be generally accepted in their communion (p. 72). The Free Church representatives quite frankly and firmly reply that there is no "prospect of its being found adequate or acceptable by the Federal Council or by the Free Churches" (p. 75), and urge that the difficulty can be met only by an "extended commission" mutually, and not from one side only in a form which would "indicate unambiguously" that it was not ordination. The sufficient reason for taking this stand is that to admit the need of episcopal ordination for a minister already ordained would be to assent to a theory of the episcopate, *i.e.,* the doctrine of the apostolic succession in the historic episcopate as the necessary and exclusive channel of sacramental grace. And to many ministers, not episcopally ordained, submission to another ordination would seem to involve denial of a most sacred experience of the sufficiency of the grace of Christ, of the presence and endowment of his Spirit.

III. In these discussions two questions raised by the Federal Council—the status of the existing Free Church ministry and the nature of the episcopate—were fully answered. Three others were briefly dealt with in special memoranda. 1. "The relation of the Free Churches to communions with which they are in fellowship in other parts of the world" (p. 41), it is stated, "would continue much as they are now" (p. 83). If the union became more organic, the situation would be so different that no definite answer can be given. It may be added as an interesting precedent that the Church of Sweden is in communion with the Church of England, and preserves its former communion with the other Lutheran churches.

2. As regards the relation of the Church to the State, while the Free Churchmen assert the claim of the Church "to enjoy complete autonomy in the discharge of all its spiritual functions," the Anglicans express their conviction that, if the Free Churches were unwilling even in a very different situation to reconsider their attitude "the Church of England might be unwilling to press the continuance of its 'Establishment,' if this proved a fatal obstacle to union" (p. 86).

3. "The safe-guarding of the evangelical principles of the Reformation" is, it is pointed out, provided for by the basis on which the conferences have been carried on; "the whole-hearted acceptance" of the Holy Scriptures and the Nicene and the Apostles' Creed, of the two sacraments and the one ministry.

4. The acceptance of the creeds just mentioned is the only other matter that needs to be referred to. The Free Church Response to the Lambeth Appeal discusses the claim of the Church to spiritual freedom in two relations—(1) to the State, (2) to creeds (p. 24). It recognizes "the need of some common declaration of faith, not to be used as a test, but to be a testimony and witness to the Lord and the Gospel," and also "the value of the ancient creeds." According to the Report accepted by Anglicans and Free Churchmen, this acceptance is, however, understood to be not "an acceptance of them as a complete expression of the Christian Faith, or as excluding reasonable liberty of interpretation," but "as agreeable to the Word of God," and as "affirming essential elements in the Christian Faith, and as preserving that Faith in the form in which it has been handed down through many centuries in the history of the Christian Church." Nor does this acceptance exclude dependence on "the continued Presence and Teaching of the Living Spirit in this Body" (pp. 38-39). Congregationalists have from time to time issued declarations of their common Faith; and given their adherence to the Federal Council's *Declaratory Statement of Common Faith and Practice.*

I have already indicated my conviction that in a united Church of the character described, no essential principle of Congregationalism would need to be sacrificed, as the local church would be left free to discharge the necessary functions of the Church as it has hitherto done. Unless Congregationalists can justify the claim that theirs is the only legitimate type of polity, and the denial of the legitimacy of the other types which have played their part in history, they should welcome the vision of a church, in which these types would be harmonized, and the distinctiveness of each church be preserved as a con-

tribution to the common truth, life, and power of the one Body of Christ. I do not plead for any uninformed or any unconsidered decision, but for an instructed and deliberate consideration with a due sense of responsibility to the Head of the Church. As one who believes intensely in the essential unity of the Body of Christ, I hope and pray that Congregationalism, as well as the other communions, may be guided by the Spirit of God to the true, right, and worthy attitude on this challenge of the hour to the Church, in which may we not even hear God's voice?

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

ISSUES RELATING TO FAITH

BY B. ALFRED DUMM, PH.D.
Associate Secretary, World Conference on Faith and Order, Boston, Mass.

WILLIAM JAMES begins his volume on pragmatism thus: "In the preface to that admirable collection of essays of his called *Heretics,* Mr. Chesterton writes these words: 'There are some people—and I am one of them—who think that the most practical and important thing about a man is still his view of the universe. We think that for a landlady considering a lodger it is important to know his income, but still more important to know his philosophy. We think that for a general about to fight an enemy it is important to know the enemy's numbers, but still more important to know the enemy's philosophy. We think the question is not whether the theory of the cosmos affects matters, but whether in the long run anything else affects them.' "

"I think with Mr. Chesterton in this matter," adds Professor James. It is not necessary to be a pragmatist to agree with this. In his *Evolution Créatrice,* Bergson claims that man, instead of being *homo sapiens,* is really *homo faciens,* and with great brilliance he develops the truth in this. But what, after all, enables man to become *faciens?* Is it not the capacity for imagination and for faith? Having devised, as Bergson says, tools to make tools, when he goes on to make tools to make tools to make tools, he is clear out in the idealistic realm of far flung syntheses. Still more in the moral realm, in all adjustments, social, economic, ethical, religious supremely, we admit the primacy of belief, of faith, of the power to deal ideally as a prerequisite to the practical.

This was strikingly reported by Bishop Brent, of the Stockholm Conference on Life and Work, where he found proposals of practical co-operation held up time and again pending de-

cisions as to Faith and Order. "Issues Relating to Faith" are, therefore, issues antedating all other issues, in Christianity. And that is where the Founder put them. The attempt of the past thirty years to make out that it "doesn't matter what a man believes, but only what he does," has reached, let us hope, its final *reductio ad absurdum,* both in history and in experiment.

The Present Problem

The present problem, therefore, is to bring all minds so into the identity of a specific Christian experience that their common interpretation of it may coalesce both in words and in determinations.

This involves, first, creeds. These are historic, contemporary, and individual. The idea of a historic creed is that at some time favourable the Church uttered a statement of faith so excellent, and which has for so long attuned the Church's expression, that it would be wasteful, if not impious, to discard it. The Nicene Creed and the Apostles' Creed, so-called, were the product of the undivided Church: why not make them again the symbols of the no longer divided Church?

Others claim that necessarily creeds become antiquated, that to properly use them it would be required again to live through the struggles that produced them, without which their very words are opaque, and that, accordingly, only contemporary creeds can have contemporary fitness, the faith of the Church naturally expressing itself thus from time to time out of its changing experience.

A third view insists that no creed can be binding on the individual, since he deals directly with God as a believer exploring truth, as did those who made the creeds, and that, therefore, creeds can have only a historical value.

But the content of the creeds is not the credal content of the Church. The nature of the Church itself is in question, whether it is a society of believers constituted by the Holy Spirit, or whether, more than that, it has a deposit or impartation of grace and authority historically as well as directly

mediated, so that outside the historic continuity of the Church the Gospel cannot be availed of in full measure.

In particular this question has to do with the nature of the ministry. It is contended on the one hand that the ministry is of sacerdotal character, that, as priests, its members perform certain functions and possess a certain authority which can only pertain to them as successors of others in lineal relation, competence for which can only be tactually imparted by episcopal ordination. On the other hand it is maintained that the priesthood of a minister is simply his specialization of function within the body of believers, who are all "kings and priests unto God," that any company of believers associated in worship and service and with a fellowship universally extended are as truly a church and a part of the universal Church as any other company, by the power resident of the Holy Spirit, and that the Spirit may call and through their action ordain to the ministry of the Gospel. It is not necessary, in stating this view of ordination, to think of it as the act of the local church. The claim is that it might be done by the Spirit through the local church in case of necessity. Generally speaking, under this view, the act is that of the fellowship of churches through representative ministers, and this fellowship is so honoured that sometimes the most individual or "congregational" churches invite ministers of other denominations to participate in the "laying on of hands," a most catholic act. The contrast at bottom of the two principles is not between the partial and the universal character of the ministry, nor as to the competence of the minister to perform any functions or exercise any authority actually pertaining or that may be found to pertain to a spiritual ministry; it lies between the conception of a sacerdotal quality impossible to secure apart from tactual, lineal succession of a class, and the conception of the entire impartation of every quality involved, known or unknown, by the Holy Spirit, in and through the fellowship of believers. It is not that the one doctrine is a "high" doctrine of the ministry and the other doctrine a "low" doctrine. One may say, to be sure, that the claim that only episcopal ordination to the priest-

hood is correct is a "high" doctrine of the ministry, but one may equally say that direct ordination by the Holy Spirit to the complete ministry is an especially "high" doctrine of the ministry.

Any brief statement on these matters must necessarily allow a good deal to leak through, and so it is well to say that the adherents of the sacerdotal theory make a distinction between a prophetic call by the Holy Spirit, which may be shared by a layman equally with a minister, and the call to the priesthood, which may be fulfilled in only one way.

There must be some specific reason back of these distinctions, and this reason is evident. It is the conception of the sacraments. Do these have a sacerdotal quality? If so, it will require a priest to minister them. Since we are here considering solely a credal aspect, it is sufficient to speak of the Lord's Supper (although I might equally allude to immersional baptism). The sacerdotal claim is that in the Eucharist the priest makes an offering of the sacrifice of Christ, and that Christ is really present in the bread and wine in some sense not clear or necessary or according to fact in the view of the non-sacerdotalist. The latter believes that for various reasons the communion is especially favourable for the imparting of Divine grace, and, of course, of a quality of spiritual experience not attainable otherwise, but he does not make it depend upon any change in the elements or any addition to them of a spiritual element. To him the action is of God within his soul, and he takes the symbolism as a part of the universal symbolism of the world and of all life, as he takes the heavens above and the earth beneath, and deep calling unto deep. He believes that when Christ said, "This is my body," He said it of bread held between his fingers, and the inferences he considers obvious.

But to the sacerdotalist a chain of reasoning is involved here, all of a credal nature. If an actual offering is made to God in the Eucharist, and if that offering is made because of a real Presence in the elements and is in fact the offering up of that Presence on our behalf, that is, of something outside the

soul of the priest and the souls of the believers partaking, then the act is interpreted in terms of priesthood as a class set apart and qualified in all ages for accomplishing objective results of a spiritual order through material instrumentalities. Somehow this objective spiritual working resides in the priest as in no other. Somehow it is imparted to him and is officially ascribed to him in his office and person; somehow there must be in the Church an organ, continuous from age to age, of a distinct quality, to impart that working; somehow the Church must be conceived as related to and in a very real sense dependent on that working, and, by consequence, on that priesthood and that episcopate, rather than the latter deriving from the Church by specialization of function. If now the creeds be attached to the sacraments because of an associated antiquity and use as determiners of communicants, we have a system of belief before us of which the creeds as such are only a part, a system of belief which really begins with the attribution of a change of some sort having to do with the elements of bread and wine, which proceeds from that to the act which produces the change, then to the person qualified for that act, then to the power that qualifies him and to its resident organ in the Church, from which through these steps there flows out to the entire body of believers the use and access of the whole virtue of the Gospel which is the power of God unto salvation.

The anti-sacerdotalist, it is true to say, is not impressed by these things. To him the chief thing is God, and the sufficient. God acts in his soul by direct communion, and not through any presence localized elsewhere. "God is a Spirit, and they that worship him must worship in spirit," means to him that communion, while aided by symbols and memorials, is in itself a thing of the inner consciousness and depends upon his soul's ability to think God's thoughts along with God and to will his purposes made manifest in Christ Jesus, and to bring every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ. He is conscious at times of an afflatus in receiving the sacrament, the Eucharist may communicate to him an ecstacy of the spirit, but

he does not localize the Presence in the elements, but rather in a spiritual indwelling in the Church, in a certain quiet but potent inwardness in the company when spiritually subdued, an indefinable depth comparable to no other. That is, the sacrament is understood through the word communion, taken in a threefold relation, rather than as an offering, although it necessitates an offering in the spirit, of the self as redeemed in Christ's great act.

Difficulties

Any statement on matters so subtle, within these limits, must be sketchy, individual, and subject to exceptions, since there are varieties of view in both directions. But if I have set forth the chief contrasts, some things are to be said. (Some will think that I should have dealt with the clauses of the historic creeds—but I have stated the *present issues.*)

In the first place, can the anti-sacerdotalist say the whole truth lies with him? Is there not something of the corporate character and power of the Church that has volatilized in his experience, not, I dare say, on his theory? But as a matter of fact, whenever the protest against sacerdotalism has become of first importance, has it not had in the end a dispersive influence on spiritual experience of a corporate character? To turn the matter round, do we not find to-day a certain desirable warmth and robustness of belief in creedal quarters which are wanting in diffusive and corporate quality in the more free churches? To take an extreme instance, whatever the opinion of the sacerdotalism in evidence, I have yet to find a Protestant unimpressed with the essential spiritual witness in the recent Roman Catholic Eucharistic Congress, or unwilling to acknowledge that the benefits of its exaltation of the supernatural accrue to all. Indeed, have we come to this! Can there be no continental witness but of Rome? Is there nowhere else an act? But have the Protestant churches a faith to produce a great dramatic moment of witness? Is it our psychology that is defective, or is it our Christology? A comparison draws attention here: while many free churches are being built with the communion

table central as an altar, the Eucharistic Congress celebrated mass in a replica of a Congregational Church in Connecticut. But I have never felt the power that would displace the pulpit for the altar. Schooled as I have been in the awe and sacrament of worship, in the great notes of the sermon the preacher is supremely priest. Is there not some corporate experience ahead of exalted witness for the Church-at-large, and is there not a way to come at it? But "we have turned every one to his own way."

On the other hand, those who hold to the sacerdotal view have, it seems to me, to go deeper. They do not supremely honour personality, in God or man. That like-mindedness which is unmediated understanding is nearest bliss in its intuitions. It surpasses symbols, and in its presence speech perishes. There is no human nearness like the soul of man to God the Father. What, once launched into intelligence, cannot get done there, cannot get done at all. Christ in his supreme act made it possible that man should see his sin as God sees it and should know that God sees it so too. The Father's heart went before, and He awaits the returning prodigal saying, "I am no more worthy to be called thy son." This is not meant to be a statement of the doctrine of the atonement, but to convey the sufficiency of personal relations personally realized and shared. With whatever expressional aid of symbolism, the efficacy is the efficacy of mind and heart.

THE NEED

I venture to say that the difficulty in both directions is at bottom one—an incomplete doctrine of the Incarnation. Sacerdotalism has never forgotten a primitive dualism: it is a perpetual attempt to secure the Divine dominance and efficacy in and through the material. The protester against it, on the other hand, has, in the person of the modernist, segregated the material from the Divine initiative altogether. He rests back in this, however, on the science of the past century. But just as the sacerdotalist needs to learn that Christ "entered in once

for all into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption," so the impatient thought of our time has need to see that the only world there is, is fitted for the incarnation of the God who made it.

The world of dead matter is a world of dead science—an outgrown world that has no present being. All Christology has been thought and argued in a world as alien to the world we are in as it is to God. All questions of miracle, the definition of the supernatural, or the doing away with it, all, pro and con, all have had their shaping in a world that does not exist—except in nineteenth century physics.

Inertness has given way to action, to immanent direction. The intra-atomic structure is a-quiver with intelligence in more subtle and intricate and astonishing ways than the starry heavens of Kant. The Mind that expresses itself in the ultimate recesses of Nature appears as all-inclusive and is the Only God there Is.

Incarnation, then, is no more a question than Creation: indeed, it is the logical outcome as well as the progressive and effective principle of it—"All things were made through him, and apart from him was not anything made that hath been made." That we are initially personal makes it but natural that He in whom all things stand together (*συνέστηκεν*, Col. 1:27) "dwelt among us."

But the Personal is the Final. When intercourse is lifted into the clearly conscious, given ethical and spiritual envisagement, and made precious in ineffable love, it supersedes the pedagogy of law, of works, and of workings: it becomes interpenetrative of soul with soul. "I live: yet not I, but Christ liveth in me."

All the same, symbols persist, are by origin universal, become sacramental. I once was called from supper by the exclamations of guests leaving the corridors for the lawn. Indescribable majesties, altitudes, infinite and mystical depths, clad in purple, rose-red, crimson, amethyst, and gold, were rising from behind the everlasting hills, swiftly forming and

re-forming across the firmament, and speaking, speaking, in a living silence in which it seemed a whisper would have reached a star. I left the watchers, ran out upon the meadow under the matchless pageant, fell down upon my face before the mountains, and wept. And yet, the true glory of Jehovah I had not seen to pass before me. All was vapour. Vapour it remained. But I had seen the symbolism of the Lord. With Turner before his sunset I saw innumerable companies of angels ascending and descending, and my soul cried with them in its sacrament: "Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God Almighty!"

B. Alfred Dumm.

ISSUES RELATING TO ORDER AND POLITY

BY FRANK K. SANDERS, PH.D.

Chairman of the Commission on Inter-Church Relations of the National Council of Congregational Churches in the U. S., New York, N. Y.

IT is clear to anyone who follows the currents of religious thinking in our world of to-day that a widespread desire prevails for a reunited Church, essentially at one in all its component parts. The Roman Catholic Church desires such a Christian unity, but only on terms which Protestantism is unable to accept. Protestantism too desires with eagerness a union of its various divisions into some very real fellowship which shall be closer than a federated alliance, which perpetuates the very divisions that are deplored, although it serves a most useful purpose. Any sincere attempt to bring about a united Protestantism deserves the sympathetic support of all who value the Church above any particular organization within it. Were the World Conference at Lausanne in 1927 to get no further than to develop a true working basis for such a united Protestantism, it would register as one of the great councils of history.

The more clearly the differences are realized in polity and order among Protestant communions which have agreed to try to find the way to unity, the greater seems the task of the Lausanne Conference. Yet our confidence in the leading of the Spirit of God gives assurance that willing thinkers can reach sane and acceptable conclusions. The process may be a long one, if every difference is recognized; yet, when our churches really make up their minds to unite, we may be confident that a way will appear. But it will not be reached by any ignoring of differences founded in conviction and cherished with zeal; it can only be attained by a friendly, resolute, continuing con-

sideration of the things on which all evangelical churches are agreed and of the steps essential to a working unity. The day may never come when all Christians will worship their Lord in one precise way, yet, as Professor Wood has recently said, "The things which unite us are more fundamental than the things which separate us." We have so much in common in convictions, in experiences, and in programmes that the other steps to be taken cannot be regarded as impossible.

Unity among communions need not prevent a wide variety in forms of worship. A bare chapel, a cave even, or a grove, has often become a true sanctuary, a house of God, although the service was of the simplest character. A beautiful building is convenient and helpful, but not essential. On the other hand, most of the communions which have preferred simplicity of worship and an emphasis upon the sermon to a worshipful ritual, are gradually recognizing and adopting in their churches many features of the Episcopal ritual as enriching and dignifying their services. No such lines are drawn as were common a century or less ago.

Nor should such a unity be too narrowly defined. The * Draft Agenda prepared by the Continuation Committee of the World Conference on Faith and Order under the subject "The Nature of the Church," contains a proposition for discussion, pointing out that the Church in the very nature of things, must have an appropriate form and recognizable existence as the Body of Christ and as a fellowship of "word and sacraments." Why should not the idea of service be included in its fellowship along with the teaching of truth and the ministry of sacraments? The unity which our day will approve and adopt

* Since this article was written, the Continuation Committee at Berne, Switzerland, took the following action on August 25, 1926:

Voted: that in view of the serious misunderstandings which have arisen and which are likely to arise in the future, should the propositions brought out by the Subjects Committee be published as part of the official programme by the Continuation Committee, and in view of the vital importance of excluding even the implications that any effort was being made to determine in advance the conclusions to be reached by the World Conference on Faith and Order, it is the judgment of the Continuation Committee that the official programme of the Conference should contain only the statement of times and places of meeting, names of officers of the Conference, including presiding officers at separate sessions, the subjects to be discussed, and the names of the speakers, all other matters pertaining to the subjects under discussion to be printed at the end of the programme accompanied by such statements as will clearly indicate that the propositions presented are not to be considered as in any sense expressions of official judgments or final conclusions, but simply as suggestive of questions which must naturally arise in any thorough consideration of the general subject. And that all resolutions to the contrary should be rescinded.

will be one expressed far more through common programmes of service to mankind than through the acceptance of minutely co-ordinated formulas of belief or by the recognition of common sacred observances. Both are of vital import, but the Christian of to-day seeks a practical expression of his devotion to Christ and the Church.

But the important forces in the process of unification is the ministry. In another subdivision the Draft Agenda reads, "The Body [*i. e.* the Church] was to be divided and united by the authority and leadership of a ministry given by Christ to the Church and recognized and respected by all its members." This statement (1) suggests clearly that the ministry is the leading influence in bringing unity into being; (2) that the ministry was commissioned by Christ to guide the Church; and (3) that the ministry has a post of authority over the Church.

At this point appear certain differences of attitude and theory among Protestants. There are those who will query whether this means that the guidance of the Church depends wholly upon its ministry. Are its ministers a court of last resort, whose final judgments must be accepted and obeyed by its membership? Such is the Roman Catholic point of view and possibly that of the Eastern Churches, but is it a good Protestant position without definite qualification? The independent churches believe implicitly in the promise that the Spirit of truth will guide the Church into an understanding of the things it needs to know. They are sure that those who sincerely desire Divine leading and who are willing to follow whithersoever it leads will come in time to a comprehension and adoption of every essential of faith or practice. But the process is one in which the ministry leads by virtue of position, culture, and insight rather than by virtue of a Divine setting-apart to the specific task of authoritative guidance. Protestant personal freedom of thinking and its maintenance of the individual's direct approach to God imply a participation of each Christian and of Christians grouped together in this process of discovering and applying truth. The minister in the independent church

is a pastor, teacher, and leader. He is the important factor in the process of Divine illuminating, but not the only factor. The Holy Spirit guides the whole Church to the acceptance of truth, generation by generation, not alone through the instruction given by the clergy, but by clarifying the judgments of the whole body. Freedom of thinking implies free conclusions. The minister is invaluable in showing the way, in opposing mistaken tendencies, in pointing out the lessons of past experience. But the Church reaches its convictions and holds to them, age by age. The query may, therefore, be raised whether the phrase "directed and united by the authority and leadership" states exactly the place and function of the ministry.

Under the subject of "The Church's Ministry," the Draft Agenda declares the necessity of a universally recognized ministry, if the Church is in any true sense to become a unity. This statement is unquestionable. But what does it really imply? one will ask. It does not and should not contemplate various ministerial grades, some reaching a "validity" denied to others. Apparently universal recognition ought to mean (1) that all the tested ministries of each recognized communion shall be on an ecclesiastical parity, recognizing one another as Christian brethren, authorized to preach, to teach, and to perform all ministerial functions; (2) that each one shall be regarded as qualified to preach in any pulpit to which he may be invited; (3) that each has authority to administer the sacraments; and (4) that the organization under which this universal ministry can best function is that of the constitutional and elective episcopate with the associated order normally apart of its activities.

When one who stands outside of episcopacy considers these proposals, he notes several important difficulties which must be forced and solved to the satisfaction of all concerned before any real union of churches is attainable, which shall include Anglicans, Episcopalians, Lutherans, and Eastern communions, as well as the Congregational, Presbyterian, and similar groups.

In the first place it may be noted that, from the standpoint of common activities, social, educational, benevolent, or mission-

ary, a real union would not be difficult. Practically the best majority of Protestants of all types find it easy and profitable to get together for such ends. Such activities give the impetus to the many federations which have been organized during the last decade or two. Even an Anglo-Catholic or a Roman Catholic could enter a union which aimed solely to achieve practical ends like those mentioned.

There are three real obstacles in the way of a unity which is to bring those of the Anglican type of confessional experience and those of the independent type into a real spiritual brotherhood, into a happy, fruitful church unity. The first of these is the episcopate as the essential, supreme administrative agency. Many Protestants cherish an inherent dislike for episcopacy as an institution. Their forefathers had a reason for this attitude; that particular reason has lost its force. Many of them, doubtless, picture a bishop as a spiritual autocrat, responsible to none but those of his own class, able, if he so desires, to force the churches to submit to his will. They fear interference with true Christian freedom. But such bishops are not contemplated by the proposals for union which we are considering. A constitutional bishop is elected because he possesses the qualities, both spiritual and social, which give him a power of wise leadership. His authority is derived in part from ancient usage, but its principal source is the active church which selects him as its acknowledged leader. Such a bishop differs in dignity, in authority, and in influence from a superintendent, yet almost every group of churches, however independent, finds some form of general organization which alters it from a mere aggregation of churches into a well-defined denomination with a history, a polity, and a group consciousness. These churches usually find it needful to provide for some forms of general management. The Congregational Church of the United States is a body in which, theoretically, every individual church is absolutely an ecclesiastical unit. In practice, however, Congregational churches yield a substantial amount of that possible and actual freedom for the sake of fellowship, efficiency, and world service. In actual fact the Congregational system or the Presbyterian

system or any other non-Episcopal system can adjust itself to an episcopate, if that office is elective, if the incumbent is broad-minded and if his will is subordinated, in the last analysis, to that of the Church as a whole. The Episcopal Church in the United States seems to permit a large degree of congregational autonomy, and it certainly recognizes the laity as having a definite and important share in formulating the judgments of the Church as a corporate whole. Thus both Episcopal and non-Episcopal churches are not so far apart that episcopacy need be a serious hindrance to union.

A more formidable obstacle from the independent church standpoint is the insistence that active ministers who have never received episcopal ordination shall be reordained by a bishop of the Anglican or Episcopal Church before they are to be recognized as on a real parity with the ministers who have received episcopal ordination. The issue at this point seems crucial. Few independent clergymen are likely to be willing to submit to a real reordination, which asuredly would stamp their earlier ministry, however successful, as "invalid." Even when there exists a genuine desire for fellowship and for active co-operation an Anglican unwillingness to admit the validity of a non-Episcopal ordination, however carefully conducted, creates a formidable barrier to the realization of a truly universal Church. Probably no minister of an independent church can enter fully into the feeling of an Episcopalian on this matter. Yet, as the Free Church representatives on the British Federal Council remarked, in replying to the memorandum of the Anglican representatives, if the Free Church ministries are, as the Anglicans were ready to declare, "real ministries of Christ's word and sacraments in the universal Church," the requirement of a fresh ordination by a bishop seemed inconsistent. Some other way must be discovered of establishing the ministerial parity demanded.

But the real and fundamental reason for this insistence on reordination constitutes the greatest difficulty of all. Curiously enough, it has not been much discussed, although it rests at the heart of the problem. It lies in the divergence be-

tween the Roman Catholic or Anglo-Catholic view of the ministry and that of independent churchmen. An Anglican need have no serious objection to the recognition of a Congregational minister as a preacher or pastor. But he strongly objects to recognize the right of such a minister validly to administer the sacraments, since, in his view, no one but a priest should perform sacramental functions.

An editorial in *The Living Church* for August of this year, commenting upon the recent letter of the Bishop of Bombay to Anglican newspapers in England, its dominions and its colonies, which presented the proposed plan for church unity in South India, remarked as follows: "In the church we invariably need priests in order that they may validly celebrate Holy Communion and pronounce absolution. Only priests may perform these offices, but Presbyterian and Congregational formularies show their conviction that priests have not been created by virtue of their respective forms of ordination. Episcopal ordination is a means to produce priests. Thus the issue with sectarianism (*sic*) is not over the historic episcopate, but over the priesthood."

If none but a priest may validly consecrate and offer the Eucharist, or if he alone can assure a penitent sinner of the Divine forgiveness of his sins, and if such a priest can only be ordained by a bishop, and if these conclusions are held to be a matter, not of historic practice which can be altered, but of Divine revelation which is unchangeable,—then the ministers of non-Episcopal churches who are unwilling to submit to reordination at the hands of a bishop, seem shut out of the proposed universal fellowship, except in some subordinated capacity.

This divergence of view, serious as it is, may not be permanent. Among independent ministers a large proportion make the Communion and other sacraments as impressive and sacred as they undoubtedly are in the Anglican churches. Their congregations are drawn by them into the very presence of the Living God, and they receive the grace and the peace of our

Lord Jesus Christ. The test of recognition in the case of such ministers should be a spiritual test, not an external one.

These three difficulties are real. Their general solution may not quickly be found. Were it to be determined in North America, the desired result might perhaps come more speedily than can be the case under existing conditions. A whole world moves slowly. But if the representatives of each communion go to Geneva next August with the genuine desire to get as far as may be practicable in the direction of unity, rather than with a fixed purpose to hold to the historic convictions which may have served great purposes in the past, there can surely be worked out, at any rate, a scheme of active fellowship and co-operation which will tend to create a habit of common action which will draw all communions closer toward the union we seek. Moreover, since the Anglican representatives at the Lambeth Joint Conferences have already gone so far as to declare that [non-Episcopal] ministries which imply a sincere intention to preach Christ's word and administer the sacraments as Christ has ordained, and to which authority so to do has been solemnly given by the church concerned, are real ministries of Christ's word and sacraments in the universal Church, it would seem that the way lies open for a further step toward some common basis of friendly and fruitful union which can be accepted whole-heartedly by all, or by nearly all, communions. For such an outcome we earnestly will pray.

FRANK K. SANDERS.

REALISM IN CONFERENCE

BY ROBERT A. ASHWORTH, D.D.
Pastor of the Baptist Church of the Redeemer, Yonkers, N. Y.

By "realism," in this connection, I understand a regard for truth and a willingness to face facts and to subject beliefs and forms to the test of conditions actually existing in the thought and life of the religious world. Without such sensitiveness to reality discussion is always useless and it is obvious that the Conference which it is proposed to hold at Lausanne can have no hopeful outcome if such a spirit and attitude are lacking.

The very idea of "conference" in our day is something to conjure with. We look to the process which it involves for the solution of the differences between labour and capital, and it is making hopeful progress in that direction. We have determined that it shall displace the devastating rivalries and conflicts between nation and nation, and that disputes shall be determined about the council table rather than by the false arbitrament of war. Similarly it is now proposed that we apply the principle to religious ideas and programmes and, as the very word implies, "bring them together for the sake of comparison or examination." The project is a noble one, and it is difficult to see how anything but good can come of it. "Let the mind of man clash with the mind of man," said Luther; "nothing but truth will be the gainer." Protestants, certainly, it would seem, who believe that the reason is trustworthy, and that it is a channel through which God reveals Himself to man, and that whatever is contrary to reason is untrue, can hardly shrink from the method of conference.

Yet it is apparent that a vast deal of indifference and of misunderstanding as to the function and purpose of the World Conference must be cleared out of the way, and that soon, if it

is to fulfil its promise. There are multitudes who are not yet ready or willing to confer.

There are some who are afraid to do so. "I have found a good many nervous Christians since coming home," writes Stanley E. Jones in *The Christ of the Indian Road,* "who are afraid that this whole thing of Christianity might fall to pieces if someone should get too critical, or if science should get too scientific. Many of the saints are now painfully nervous. They remind me of a lady missionary with whom I walked home one night after a very tense meeting in a Hindu theater (at which Hindu students were invited to ask questions of the speaker). She said, 'Mr. Jones, I am physically exhausted from that meeting to-night.' When I asked her the reason she said, 'Well, I didn't know what they were going to ask you next, and I didn't know what you were going to answer, so I've been sitting up there in the gallery holding on to the bench with all my might for two hours, and I'm physically exhausted.' " Similarly there are those to-day who do not invite conference on matters of either Faith or Order with those with whom they differ because of some such disquietude as this. They are conscious that the spiritual and intellectual weather during the last half century has been very hard on denominational fences, though they are not sure how much damage has been done. They are metaphorically hanging on to their seats lest it should be found that the rationale of their distinctive ideas and practice has been so far weakened that it will disintegrate under inquiry. Their denominational tenets are properly dear to them, and they are uncertain how these would bear the light, if it were centered upon them, and hesitate to subject them to the strain and risk.

There are also those who fear lest any attempt to discover common ground will merely serve to reveal how hopelessly Christians are divided in their convictions both as to Faith and Order, and disclose the poverty of the content of the united Christian consciousness and so do more harm than good. They think that religious differences should not be accentuated by discussion but should rather be decently concealed.

On the other hand, just as there may be those who shy at such a conference as is being arranged because they are a little shaky on their doctrinal and ecclesiastical pins, there are others who, for an opposite reason, because they are so pronounced and sure of their views, so certain that they are always and wholly right, think it to be unnecessary and undesirable. They are like the recalcitrant party in a labour controversy — they "have nothing to arbitrate."

But there are also multitudes of Christian people who for more worthy and defensible reasons are lukewarm or indifferent in their attitude. It may be that they believe that the Conference is called in the interest of a particular doctrine of the Church, the so-called "catholic" conception, with which they are wholly unsympathetic. They who hold this view believe the Church to be founded by Jesus Christ and authorized by Him to exercise its functions in his behalf for the benefit of the entire Kingdom of God, and they hold that the validity of its Orders of the ministry and its authority to administer the sacraments, through which supernatural grace is conveyed, depend upon the perpetuation in the Church of the commission given by Christ to the apostles and transmitted by them to the first bishops of the Church and thence in succession, through an unbroken line of bishops, by the laying on of hands, to the present day. It can easily be understood that those who wholly reject this conception of the Church, but who believe that it is certain to dominate the World Conference, and who have observed the failure of negotiations between the Anglican and Free Churches of Great Britain because of differences at this very point, are not very optimistic as to the value of further discussion.

Finally, to mention no more obstacles now standing in the way, we must face frankly the settled conviction of many earnest souls that organic church union, on any basis, is hardly to be desired, but that such a union of spirit and effort as is now gradually being promoted by co-operative activities of many sorts is to be preferred above it. The ideal of such is

visualized in some such figure as that of Professor Nicholas Glubokowsky, of Petrograd, quoted by Archbishop Söderblom—the picture of a Russian house, divided by low walls into several rooms. Thus living in separate apartments, each of which is a home to a family, beloved and familiar, each group maintains a separate existence. But above there are no dividing walls, and men may communicate and live together in neighbourly fashion. "Do not move the walls," they say, "but let us all grow in faith, hope, and love, so that we reach above the divisions and see and show our membership of the same Church and congregation of Christ."

Taking these objectors in order we may pass over as negligible the weak-kneed ones who want no questions asked for fear it might wreck their faith. They are followers, never leaders, and as they cannot aid, so they cannot greatly hinder religious progress.

Of the dogmatists of the extreme type who are sure they are always right and whose idea of compromise is that others shall adopt their programmes, we must regretfully say that conference with them, in any real sense, is, of course, impossible. Deep convictions, however, are no obstacles to conference, indeed they are essential to it; for who would go far to discuss with others, in the hope of winning others to them, beliefs which he holds himself only loosely or only lightly esteems? But there must be respect for the position of another, on the other hand, and a resolute determination to understand it, or conference loses the note of reality. To a conference also there must be brought an open mind, a willingness to be convinced, or it is futile from the outset. As well remain at home as confer with others with a mind hermetically sealed against the entrance of a new or unwelcome idea. The Roman Catholic Church, for example, is logical, wise, and kind in refusing to participate at Lausanne, for it has burned its theological bridges behind it: its commitments are such, since Trent, that its course is determined beforehand. It cannot change.

"I beseech you, in the bowels of Christ," cried Oliver Cromwell to Samuel Rutherford, "think it possible you may be mistaken!" Those who for any reason find it impossible to heed that plea, of whatever communion they may be, are disqualified from conferring with their fellows. It will always be found hard to amalgamate the doctrinal or ecclesiastical "stand-patters," who are satisfied as they are and have ceased to grow, but the most hard-shelled dogmtists may profitably meet, so long as they retain the ability to shed their shell and grow larger.

When we reach the differences of doctrine as to the Church, with their implications, which seem to some so formidable that it is of no use to meet to discuss them, we must admit that we are approaching the crux of the situation as it now confronts us. The discussions during the years of preparation for the World Conference have served to make this obvious. The "Catholics," and they who think of the Church as "simply the voluntary association for mutual help and service of the world by those who have been saved," to quote Dr. T. R. Glover, seem to be moving on parallel lines which never meet. The cogs of their thought upon the question slip by one another; they do not engage. There is excuse for those who question the value of conference between Christians who appear to hold mutually exclusive ideas, incapable of compromise or reconciliation.

We should rather say, however, that these differences of view constitute a supreme challenge to the Christians of our day, and the most urgent argument for conference. How shall we think of the Church? The rift between the separated communions will grow into an impassable chasm unless we can achieve here some semblance of an understanding. Both interpretations cannot be right. Both may be wrong, or each wrong in part. It would seem to be axiomatic that there must be some virtue and truth in any great conviction which has been held with tenacity and which has served the spiritual needs of multitudes for many generations. Differences at this point, therefore, would appear to argue, not that these contrary interpretations should be held apart, but that they should be brought

together and laid down side by side for analysis and comparison.

Such an assemblage of ideas might lead to the conclusion that unity of interpretation at this point is impossible. This would not determine the question of the possibility of the unity of Christians, however. It might only serve to indicate that identity of opinion on this matter is non-essential and that the lack of it need not hold Christians apart. On the other hand, some inclusive statement might be formulated which, dealing in positives rather than negatives, would reaffirm the truth in each conflicting interpretation, and prove to be a bond of closer unity. It is generally our negations that divide us and our affirmations that draw us together. Even though the Conference should agree that differences exist which cannot be mediated, and which are so significant as to preclude organic union, this still would be a step in advance. Agreeing upon what is for the present impossible, we should cease to waste energy in striving for it, and turn our attention toward such channels of co-operation as a new understanding may indicate to be practicable.

In any case the differences of whatever kind which admittedly exist are a reason for participation in the World Conference, not for withholding from it. Without conference differences grow. They do not diminish. The tendency of separatism is to become isolated, insular, introspective, self-centered, centripetal, and partial. Examination of the courses of study in some of our theological seminaries would lead us to suspect that those who prescribe them labour under the delusion that the denomination to which they belong comprises the whole of Christendom, and that the fortunes of the Kingdom of God depend upon the sedulous propagation of that denomination's distinctive principles. The most certain cure for that delusion is the discovery how widely it is shared, that every denomination is its victim. Since there are a hundred and fifty different denominations in the United States, each claiming at least one distinctive principle which seems to it sufficiently essential to warrant its separate existence, it must follow, unless some are

deluded, that there are at least one hundred and fifty principles essential to Christianity, of which each single denomination lacks one hundred and forty-nine! This reduces the proposition to absurdity. Many denominations must be deluded. Perhaps all are deluded, and no principle which is distinctive is essential, true, and important though it may be, but only those notes which all sound in common. If such a Conference as is being planned should make this discovery and substantiate it, and then proclaim it, how abundantly worth while it would be!

As for those who hesitate to participate because unconvinced as to the desirability of organic union, it may be said that they are misinformed if they believe that such is the immediate object of the Conference. That question has not been prejudged or predetermined. There is needed in such a Conference those predisposed to organic union, and those indisposed toward it. It should be, to be most helpful, a cross section of Christendom, with all elements represented and heard. It must not be forgotten that the Conference can determine nothing; it cannot even pass resolutions or bind the churches by word or vote. The Conference can only confer, and formulate the conclusions at which it arrives. But out of the clash of mind on mind and the rub of spirit against spirit, the communion of heart with heart, and the mingling of prayers, there should come some great, fresh spiritual impulse that will set all Christendom throbbing with new life, a new appraisal of the things that divide and a new appreciation of the wealth of the spiritual heritage which all Christians share in common, and a new love one for another.

This will constitute that "next step toward unity" which, when the Conference was first proposed, it was hoped might be taken. The most urgent present need is a better mutual understanding among the divided communions of Christendom. Out of understanding between men of good-will flows love, and love is the prime requisite of unity. To promote it is "the next step."

ROBERT A. ASHWORTH.

THE CHALLENGE OF A PILGRIM FAITH

BY R. EDIS FAIRBAIRN, D.D.
United Church of Canada, Courtland, Ontario

It becomes obvious, in the light of historical criticism, that Israel failed God, not because it became apostate and repudiated the covenant, but because it had not the faith that could respond to the call of God through the prophets, and, like its progenitor Abram, move out and forward in the service of a larger loyalty to Jehovah.

Christendom has flourished as it broke loose from hindering traditions and institutions to march with Christ, and it has also failed its Lord when, faced with new situations and called to go forth in untried ways, it has shown loyalty to its institutions and traditions rather than to the implications of its pilgrim faith. Such crises are at once the test and the opportunity of religion. Not in all the varied story of the Christian ages has so critical and promising an adventure of faith offered itself to the churches as that which in our day bids them awaken to a new consciousness of the Church, and act out their Amen! to the prayer of the Lord for his disciples, that they might be one. Will the Christianity of our generation have insight and energy and courage to respond? There are men of wide acquaintance with the personnel of the churches who are frankly doubtful of the possibility of any real result from the endeavour to get the churches together in conference. On the other hand there are signs that indicate the activity of the Divine Spirit in the midst of, and in spite of, human prejudices and inertias. At any rate the call has gone forth, an open door confronts us; Christianity must deal with the opportunity either with courage or timidity, and whatever happens the churches cannot be quite the same afterwards.

The churches have been asked to appoint representatives for the World Conference on Faith and Order to be held next year at Lausanne. They are further requested to prepare themselves intelligently and spiritually, and in the way of group discussion on the basis of a tentative agenda. A preparation intellectual and spiritual is indeed required. Of course, since the activities of spirit are thought, feeling, and will, the intellectual is properly part of the spiritual, and it is a vicious fallacy that so often sets the intellectual and the spiritual in antithesis. But for the very reason that church differences have an intellectual basis and must be intellectually investigated, a much deeper adjustment of the whole method and manner of our approach to them must be secured if we are not to be bogged in intellectual confusion. Meanwhile let us note, what should be obvious, that the effort to find agreement does, in the first place, call for a combined endeavour of close, sound, and heroic thinking. It is necessary to stress this elementary fact because there has been a certain amount of well-meaning obscuration of it. It is time we stopped side-stepping sharp issues with smooth words about our differences indicating mere variations of view-point, of temperamental preference, or racial peculiarity. Members of the same Body of Christ do not anathematize one another on account of variations of emphasis, or temperamental preferences. Of course, not all the separate churches do mutually deny the genuine Christianity of each other. But Roman Catholic, Baptist, and Episcopal churches, for instance, do, in principle, however ingeniously they may qualify their exclusions, or fraternize unofficially, like troops in No-man's-land on Christmas eve. The barriers to unity were intellectually conceived, and can only be intellectually removed. There can be no approach to reunion except through a re-thinking of basal principles. Every church participating in the Conference must do so in the spirit that is at once prepared to make a clear statement of its own position, and to be shown if, where, and how, its position is unsound.

Close and heroic thinking, — that is the prime necessity. What must, at all costs, be avoided is clever debating. How to

prevent the forthcoming Conference from developing into a full-dress inter-church debate with the consequent sterility of all debates,—that is what is giving concern to the organizers. It is the clever dialecticians who have been the pest of the churches through the Christian ages. When the churches give themselves to prayer for the success of the Conference, let them be specific. Let them petition the Throne of Grace that when representatives are being appointed all the brilliant debaters may be providentially eliminated. What the situation calls for is a heroic re-investigation of our own prepossessions that we may test them by the standard of reality, and then the grace to exhibit our convictions to those who sympathetically desire to understand in order that they may rightly compare and estimate. If Christian agreement is ever to come, it will not be as one party imposes its convictions upon others, but only as we each discover where we are wrong, in the common spirit of loyalty to reality. It is the re-exploration of our own prepossessions that is the difficult thing.

If we can do that thoroughly we are bound to find out that some of our differences are due to over-emphasis upon what is unessential, to over-confidence in what is uncertain, and, in some instances, convictions that have seemed vital will be found baseless and worthless. Mistakes thus recognized would have to be acknowledged. The Roman Catholic claim to absolute authority would have to be validated or dropped. The Episcopal insistence upon a particular form of church government must be shown to be necessary and original, or recognized as optional. The Baptist demand for immersion baptism for adult believers only must be demonstrated as scripturally compulsory, or an imposition upon the Gospel. In the course of any such collective investigation many things would be found to have a basis in tradition and usage and honour, but by no means in origin and primal necessity. What is erroneous would be acknowledged; what is uncertain or unessential would be referred to Christian liberty and charity, what appeals to special temperaments would be made room for in a consolidated Christianity. But this at least would be clear, that no doctrine,

polity, or institution, the grounds of which are not demonstrable to men of good-will, must be allowed to become an occasion of schism, or to justify continued schism.

But even while we see and say these things, our heads are gently shaking our unbelief in the human possibility of constituting such a conference in such an atmosphere. Let it be admitted that it is a thing impossible with man. Then let us reckon with God.

Before there can be any agreement in intellectual apprehension, there must be a compass adjustment of the mind,—rather, of the whole spirit. That is what is meant by spiritual preparation; not a securing of a state of exalted emotion, but the establishment of a supreme loyalty to reality that definitely subordinates denominational interests. It has only been possible for sharp divergences to occur in the past because sectional loyalties have distorted vision. Only as we are prepared to set aside sectional interests and group prestige can there be any healing of the wounds of the Body of Christ. The cure for the ordinary stupidity and very commonplace pride that have disgraced the Christian record lies in a complete loyalty to reality. Those who are sceptical of any good coming from the proposed Conference are depressed because they know how impregnable are the sectional loyalties of religious people. Here, they feel, is an immovable obstacle; where is the irresistible force, and what will happen, if anything, when they collide? Well, there certainly is an irresistible force at work in the world before our eyes; what it will do to the immovable obstacle we who live longest will see.

Loyalty to reality above all prejudice or interest is a principle which has been growing among men for some few centuries. That such a thing as a conference with a view to Christian agreement is even conceivable is a sign that it has come to real power in human affairs. The prophets among us see that, in the very nature of things, it must grow from more to more; they see it to be an operation of the present Spirit of God, and they pin their hopes for ultimate Christian solidarity to it. It is only comparatively recently that it has become oper-

ative in religion. For centuries it has been so identified with the natural sciences that we customarily speak of it as the "scientific method." It is true that it has created the modern sciences in distinction from the ancient pseudo-sciences. Since Roger Bacon emphasized "inquisition" over "disquisition" the students of the material universe have moved upon the path of careful observation, investigation, experimentation, and corroboration. They have sat humbly at the feet of Things-as-they-really-are. They have rigorously suppressed all prepossession in order to hear the still small voice of truth. And the method and attitude have abundantly justified themselves. But as a method and attitude they are not specially scientific, that is, not confined to the investigation of the material universe. It was a calamity that the manifestations of this spirit in the Renaissance and the Reformation should historically have taken separate channels. Only in our own day are the streams approaching one another again. It will mark a new era for mankind when the intervening bank crumbles and breaks. If only they be faithful to themselves, science must give a wider, and religion a more courageous loyalty to reality.

Here we are right at the heart of the difficulty confronting the attempt to secure reconciliation between the divided churches. Can we men of religion rise to this height of a supreme loyalty to reality, a reality above and beyond our party interests? Can we adopt a willingness to be convinced of error that is more than a strategic pose of humility? Can we achieve such a clarity of mind as to see through and past our own self-deceptions? Can we, setting aside our traditional and technical formulas, state afresh for ourselves the basic principles upon which we have stood as separate churches, justifying them by a necessary connection with historical and spiritual fact? Can we then exhibit our statement to our brothers as those who desire to understand our point of view rather than to demolish our arguments? Can we dig down beneath those blank ultimata upon which we have taken our stand as though they were the rock of ages itself: "The Church stands fast upon her Divinely constituted authority"; "No

Baptist would ever admit . . . . "; "Episcopalians cannot doubt that . . . . ," etc., etc. It is not just the ignorant and bigoted, but men of knowledge and good-will to the idea of reunion, who are unable to conceive of churches overcoming their ecclesiastical loyalties in favour of a collective re-investigation of religious reality. Yet there are signs and wonders in the earth for those who have eyes to see, which make belief in such a miracle not altogether preposterous.

The movement organized for the purpose of securing a World Conference on Faith and Order had its origin in the Episcopal Church of the United States. It was, therefore, natural that the Draft Agenda, prepared as a tentative guide for discussion preparatory to, and during, the proposed Conference, should favour some form of episcopacy, and should be concerned primarily with the original nature and constitution of the Church. So the section on "The Nature of the Church" is prefaced by a note: "This subject is placed first because an advance toward agreement concerning the nature of the Church is the first necessity in the movement toward union." But a gathering of the representatives appointed by the American Episcopal Church, convened to discuss the general attitude to be taken by them in the Conference, found itself able to see further than that. They petitioned the Continuation Committee asking that "Topics treating of the Faith may precede those relating to the Church, and that those relating to the Ministry may be put last on the Agenda." This emendation would seem to be obviously required, but it has immense significance as coming from the particular group. The incident is more than inspiring; it is startling, and a sharp rebuke to the weakness of our faith in a present Spirit of God. Given the same kind of attitude among representatives of the other churches, nothing would be impossible, nothing could be too good to be true. The way would be cleared to a further advance in the same direction. Before we can even discuss the Faith it is necessary that we shall re-explore Jesus Christ in whom we have faith. We must ask afresh what is the significance of Our Lord for us in the world of to-day, and what is involved in loyalty to Him

under the conditions of our modern world. That is a work which is going forward in our time independent of any attempt to bring the churches together. Religion in all the churches was suffering from a hardening in the forms of belief. To accomplish its needed work the Gospel *must* again burst the old wine-skins. What the writers of the New Testament did for their contemporaries must be done for the people of our time, and we must use their writings to help us to see the thing they were trying to explain, rather than to stereotype their explanation and impose it upon us. We have to ask, and persist in the endeavour to answer the questions, "What is this Jesus Christ to us men of the twentieth century world; what can He, does He, do for us in the way of the redemption of life, individual and social; and what does the following of Jesus require of us?"

Oh yes; men are rising above their prejudices and sectional loyalties in homage to reality. The very success of the method used by pure science, and demonstrated to the observation of the most unlearned by applied science, must more and more force it upon our use in all departments of life. If not now, certainly in the near future, the logic of events will make its application to church life inevitable. Let it but proceed, and it must ultimately bring the Christian people of the world to the place from which they may, at least, make a whole-hearted endeavour to secure Christian solidarity.

Let these three things be clearly grasped and firmly kept in mind. Each church must explore afresh and for itself the relation of its fundamental principles to reality. All the churches must consecrate themselves to the endeavour to listen courteously and sympathetically that they may understand the position of each other church, described from within. Then they must proceed, trusting in the miraculous grace of God, to co-ordinate what is true, eliminate what is false, and secure liberty in the one Church of Christ for the exercise of the varying gifts of the Spirit.

R. Edis Fairbairn.

THE FAITH AND MYSTERY OF CONFERENCE

BY REV. HERBERT KELLY

Member of the Society of the Sacred Mission, Kelham, Newark-on-Trent, England

THE difficulties of our conferences are primarily historical. Once our fathers split. Were they right to do it? We feel very sure. All our common text-books have been written that we should remember the old grievances, and there is the instinct of self-preservation. But that is not all we mean. We have to justify, we must try to understand, the ways of God. It cannot be that God meant nothing by all these struggles. It is not mere vanity which to each of us makes the story, at least, of our own society so precious. Yet now God seems to be making a new call, opening to us a vision of what I would venture to call a catholic unity, in which all that He may have given to any shall be the heritage of all, shared by all, at least within reach of all. The vision is not universally received. Many, whose ways of thought and belief are widely opposed, are yet convinced that what they hold is the absolute truth of God, needing nothing. I cannot think that attitude entirely in accord with the creeds, which seem to set before us God Himself —the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost—as the object of our faith, and there is some real danger that this infinite truth by which we are held, to which we cling, may be confused with the finite doctrines and systems which we maintain or use.

I speak, therefore, of conferences under the heading of "Faith." We cannot believe that our fathers, or we, have

---

AUTHOR'S NOTE: I have sprinkled this article somewhat freely with text references which I have no space to follow up, though I am afraid they may distract attention. I advise the reader to ignore them, but, if anyone should wish to weigh the points afterwards, he might find them suggestive. They are much better worth considering in their sequence than the article itself.

sought and lived in vain, but then we ought not to believe that of others. We have something to give others; we have also to learn from them. But it is in conference that the difficulty of faith meets us. The infinity, the unmeasuredness, of God—that which makes us all learners—is an abstract faith. What we actually hold, know, possess, is very much measured, yet it is for each of us the solid basis on which we have built, on which alone, surely, we can build.

And this difficulty is, I think, increased by certain phrases, which seem to help us. It has been often repeated that "all parties are right in what they affirm; wrong in what they deny." In some respects this is a very appealing phrase, yet how is it that our own statements always seem to us positive, and the other man's seem essentially negative? In fact, does not every affirmative involve a negative? Some have, therefore, insisted that we should drop all dogma and admit all institutional forms to be indifferent. But would not this be to negative all affirmations alike, so that all of us would be wrong in what we affirm, and right in what we deny?

If any phrase ever appeals to us, it is by virtue of some truth in it. First, this phrase implies there is a Gospel of God we can affirm and preach, a way of God we can trust and follow. Secondly, it implies that we have been truly led by God, and must hold fast that we have received. Thirdly, that this positive Gospel has to be learned before it is preached, and understood that it may be followed. The Gospel is very simple, but our life is very complex, and our understanding defective. God has taught you and me a great deal. Let us cling to it, but God has not taught, will not teach, you and me everything lest we come to self-sufficiency (Gen. 3:5). You and I are not the only people He teaches, for He would have us learn of one another (I Jno. 4:20).

Nevertheless, man is not saved by phrases, and we do well to be a little skeptical. This phrase has only restated our difficulty that what has to be learned is that which is not yet known (Phil. 3:12). Certainly the Gospel is essentially simple

and affirmative (Acts 4:12), but it does not negate, it gathers into itself, all lesser apprehensions (Jno. 12:32; Heb. 1:1). We complicate it by imagining we have comprehended it (Jno. 1:5; Rom. 9:3); thereby the Gospel itself is confused with, narrowed to, our understanding of it, and that is real negation.

This first phrase we must keep in mind, for it is really helpful. There is another very common rule of conferences, which I am inclined to think positively misleading. It is said "we should begin with our agreements, and narrow as much as we can the points on which we disagree." This seems to me a false psychology, following the familiar image of a fenced road, having definite turnings, or forks. To a certain extent there are beaten tracks which we can use, guiding ourselves by others—we are meant to do so—but in the true life-history each soul follows, makes, its own road. The words we use have a different content according to the experience of each who uses them. We have all heard of mountains, but the word brings up very different images to the climber, to the tourist, the farmer, the teamster, who live or go among them, still more different to the plain-dweller. The name of God is instinct with every thought and experience of a man's life.

In conference we offer one another phrases about God, his Christ, the Holy Spirit, and moral ideals, and we think we agree. Then we come to another class of questions, and apparently we disagree. But a man's mind does not work in straight lines with angles — as it were a graph on squared paper. If at a certain point we find a difference, it is because there was a divergence from the first which only at this point has got free to show or to express itself. That is why our secondary points are so troublesome and so stubborn. Trying to whittle them down leads to nothing. We ought rather to use them as a doctor uses small differences of symptoms which are important, not of themselves, but by their significance.

A conference is necessarily much involved in the question of phrases and formulæ. Any decisive result it can hope to reach must be so given. After all, the mind-movement has to

be embodied somehow in graphs, or—to use another metaphor—however tracks wander, a made-up road to bear common traffic must be a fixed thing. And here a kind of despair comes over us for two apparently opposed reasons:—

The first is universally recognized. Words are so futile, because they mean so much less than we do. Take one of the little points of difference. "No. I cannot accept that." Why not? The whole history of a life from childhood upwards has led me to THIS. How can I explain it to a man whose whole history is different? I struggle to explain, because God has given me this, in order to help others, yet no words will cover it.

There is a second difficulty—which I think is often forgotten. Words frighten us, for they often mean so much more than we do. "I believe in God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth." Then I pause. Do I mean all that? There is the God of my childhood, mother's God, a very precious memory; the God I preach, the congregational God of church-going; there is the devotional God of my personal life. But God the Father, Maker and Ruler of all the courses of the universe and of history, before this unmeasuredness, the measure of my tiny mind can only bow. The words mean so much more than I can possibly mean, yet I know it is the only true meaning. Lord, I believe (Jer. 10:11; Job 41:2, 3).

I would summarize three practical inferences concerning (I) the initial mind of a conference; (II) its procedure; (III) its end.

(I) Concerning its first spirit, I feel specially sure that to expect, to seek, an immediate result from a conference is suicidal. There are still multitudes of religious people convinced that they have nothing to learn, but most, without going that far, are quite satisfied that they know as much as they need to, and are as right as anybody can be. Even at its best, "learning from others" is somewhat of an abstract faith. At a conference we can hardly expect more than to gain some vision of what God may be meaning for us, but it will take years of

quiet thinking before we find the road to it from where we are. If anyone asks us to agree now, not always, perhaps, for there are no universal rules, but, mostly speaking, in sheer self-defence, we shall start finding reasons why we do not admit it.

(II) About procedure, I am much less than no authority, but it always seems to me that the essential business of a conference is asking questions. No doubt we must begin by formulating statements, but not in the conference itself. Nothing is more futile than trying to get up a discussion on a statement just made, which no one has had time to consider and weigh. But, all that having been done beforehand, it is the very purpose of a conference that we should bring up the objections, all the objections, which otherwise we should have nursed secretly in our minds. For this, and other reasons given above, the sooner we get to the difficult questions the better. But all our objections must be in spirit, in substance, in form, questions. It is one thing to say—"This and this reasoning makes your position difficult to me, how do you answer them?" To say—"This and this refute your view, anyhow so far as I am concerned" is not to confer, but to pass a judgment, and to judge before the case has been heard. Let us stick to questions—that is the essence of learning. If we can see something we agree to, even partly, by all means let us say so—if only to cheer up the angels a bit. Where we do not, or too vaguely commit ourselves, it is best to go away silently, that we may give them and our minds another chance.

(III) What should be the final aim or result of conference? By what road can we hope that reunion might come? Here also I would note three points.

1. We need especially to beware of narrowing acceptance, which is a very real thing, within the limits of agreement, which is a much smaller thing and so looks to us more practical. When we went to school, I suppose in fact arithmetic was set before us through the ideas which the schoolmaster could give us. But our parents were anxious that we should learn arithmetic. It never occurred to them to ask whether we "agreed"

with the schoolmaster. Agreement is of statable opinions, which we both know, understand, and hold. The acceptance which is of faith is almost essentially of the unknown. In the Birth, the Cross, the Resurrection of Christ, in Holy Scripture, we all long ago accepted a Gospel and a guidance which the experience of a lifetime leaves but dimly apprehended.

2. So in faith, we come to learn of others, to share in all that God has given to them. But who are these "others"? (Lk. 10:29). We are too apt to think only of those present, whose views are pressed on us. It is the whole Christendom, from the first day of Pentecost, in which continuously the Spirit works. Every age has its own sins and failings. They are our sins, written for our warning (I Cor. 12:2). Every age has its own glory and achievement, which are our heritage. The former treatises were written of all that Jesus *began* to do and teach; it is for us to learn what He is doing and teaching now, that the ages after us may learn also. No doubt criticism, sifting, is an essential part of learning, but, while anything we can find of truth is certainly of God, our objections may be only failures to understand.

3. Matters of Faith consist primarily in a vision of principles. Only as we try to make the vision our own do we come to realize explicitly what is involved. Controversially, matters of Order, institutions, organization, ways of doing things, are much harder to handle, because the explicit comes first.

HERBERT KELLY.

THE MISSIONARY ASPECT OF DOCTRINAL UNITY

BY JOHN J. BANNINGA, M.A., D.D.
Union Theological Seminary, Pasumalai, South India

THE question as to whether the churches should unite and form again the one Body of which Christ is the Head is not one of theoretical interest on the foreign field, but is one of intensely practical reality. At the recent meeting of the Joint Committee on Union of the Wesleyan, Anglican, and South India United Churches, the Bishop of Bombay reports an Indian member as saying, "If you missionaries cannot get together into one church, we Indians will meet by ourselves and bring that object to pass." The Christians in the mission lands are determined that there shall be but one Christian Church in their lands. They have no interests in the things that divide us and they realize that they must be united to accomplish the great task before them.

What they want, of course, is real union. They do not want a victory for one church as over against other churches, and they do not care to see one church swallow all the other churches. Too many Westerners seem to approach the question of union from the standpoint of their church and the feeling that if they could only get others to see their point of view then all could unite. This is true of Independents as well as of Episcopalians. But such a victory would not bring unity. What the Indian wants is a unity based on India's need and interpretation of Jesus Christ. What she does not want is the forcing upon her of any particular polity or theology that was thought out centuries ago on western soil.

To accomplish this a multitude of conferences will be necessary. Joint committees will have to meet and talk things over and then report their findings to their particular churches, and

then come back for further conferences, and so on until the churches understand the questions at issue and can see and understand each other's points of view. Every meeting that the Joint Committee on Union in South India has held has shown conclusively that even the best church history scholars present did not understand fully the position of their friends from the other churches. But each meeting has also proven that, by such conferences, persons and churches were being drawn closer together. Hence continued conferences are needed. And in them and around them there must center an abundance of prayer that the Spirit may be present to lead into all truth.

Not only are local conferences needed. It is high time that the World Conference should meet and that representatives of the churches of the world should there get together for consultation and prayer. We do not know each other well enough to understand what is meant when we talk even in the same language. The preparations for the World Conference and the reports of the meetings held will call the world's attention again to this great need as nothing else can do.

Of course, we must not forget that there already is a great deal of unity in the various parts of the Christian Church. This is especially true of the foreign field, where missionaries and Nationals of the various countries have united in a multitude of ways to carry on the work of the Kingdom. Schools, hospitals, printing presses, Bible societies, young people's organizations, national and provincial councils, — all these and many more forms of co-operation have brought Christians together into a real brotherhood that has prepared them in large measure for organic union in the Church.

There are two aspects of the union question that are especially of interest to Indian Christians. These are, first, their lack of concern for the things that have divided the Church in the past; and, second, their immense concern for a union in an evangelism that will win India for Christ to-day.

Indian Christians are not, in the first instance, concerned with the controversies that divided the Church in the past.

The Indian is not an historian. He has no accurate records of his own country and does not know how that country developed historically, nor does he care. Nor is he concerned to dig out of the past the things that may be learned. He leaves that to foreign scholars. The Indians who have gone in for a study of history along scientific methods may be numbered on the fingers of one's hands. Hence we cannot expect Indian Christians to be interested in the controversies of the early church councils, nor in the strife of the patriarchs, nor in the Reformation disputes. Somehow or other the Gospel appeals to them directly. There is such a close affinity between Palestine and India that they do not have to find Christ through all the tomes of European lore, but see Him directly through his own parables and miracles. The atmosphere seems clearer. The sun shines brighter. Externals seem to have less value, while one seems to see more deeply into the very heart of things.

The Christological controversies of the fourth and fifth centuries do not seem to touch the Indian consciousness at all. India's Pantheism, her doctrines of incarnation, and her idea of the unity of the whole universe, make to them such questions as the inclusion or the omission of the "filioque" clause in the creeds entirely unnecessary. But the Indian does feel that he must be given time to think out some of these things for himself and that he must not be asked to accept, without question, that which has been decreed by this or that council of the ancient or modern church. And he is perfectly right in this. Christian theology will not have reached its final solution until the best minds of the Orient have been given the opportunity to think their way through this subject along with the best minds of the Occident. There are still too many things which we "see in a glass darkly" to allow us to insist that the missionary church must accept all that we of the West have thought true.

This was also true of the apostolic church. It was not the church at Jerusalem but the church at Antioch, Ephesus, and Corinth that determined the question of circumcision. The

council at Jerusalem was perfectly correct in method and in conclusion, for they took all the evidence before they made their findings. And the method was also the only correct one. As Dean Hodges of the Episcopal Theological Seminary at Cambridge, Massachusetts, showed in a paper in the *Harvard Theological Review* in 1920, that first council based its conclusion on the fact that they and the Holy Spirit were in agreement on these points. "It seemed good to the Holy Spirit, and to us," they say, and on the basis of that authority they send forth their findings. And Dean Hodges says that that is the only basis on which there can be church union in any age. When representatives of the churches *and the Holy Spirit* can come to agreement on matters, those are the matters that should stand for that age. But as the Spirit is a living personality, He can and does reveal Himself from age to age and helps the Church in each age to carry forward his great work. And we must find the matters that are vital to our age if we want church union in the mission fields to-day.

Members of certain churches have argued that God's original plan was that accepted by the early churches and continued through to the time of the Reformation. But others argue with equal force, and perhaps with even more conviction, that the history of the second and third centuries showed a decadence and a conformity with the world; whereas the history of the Reformation showed a casting away by the Spirit of what was non-essential and a selecting of that which was vital, and they point to four hundred years of God's manifest blessing as a proof that God approved of what they did. But to both of these the Indian Christian says, "I do not care so much what happened in the third or in the sixteenth centuries. What I want to know is what does the Holy Spirit want the Church to do in India to-day."

And it is just here that we see the second great concern of the Indian church come out. The problem immediately before that church is the winning of all classes of their countrymen to the fellowship of the Gospel. And the aspect that arrests

attention at this moment is that it would almost seem as though many Indians were beginning to see Jesus Christ *apart* from the Church. Paul wrote to the Romans, "Now apart from the law a righteousness has been revealed," and the modern apostle in India can almost say that apart from the Church a Kingdom of God is being established in India. For men who have been imbued with the spirit and zeal of their ancestral faiths are finding an inspiration in Jesus Himself that has come to them quite apart from the work of the Church, and, unless the Church can unite in a supreme effort to divest itself of those things that are entirely foreign to India and give to India a united interpretation of the Gospel message, we may see multitudes coming and taking the Kingdom by force and making its outward expression something very different from that which we of the West have supposed was the true interpretation.

There are difficulties in the Gospels that an Oriental finds that we have never seen. For instance, an Indian recently said to a missionary that the great stumbling block for him in the Gospels was the slaying of the fatted calf as related in the parable of the prodigal son. What is going to be the attitude of the Indian church to this question of beef-eating? Oh, it is easy for a Westerner to say, "Why, the Indian must learn that that is all right," but the Indian does not feel that way about it. And then there is the question of disciples in John 9—"Who did sin, this man or his parents?" The Hindu sees in that a reference to transmigration. What is the Church to say about that question? And there are a multitude of other questions that have never arisen in the western church but which must be faced in the Orient. The Indian Christian asks that church unity be considered from the standpoint of his needs as well as from the standpoint of western history.

Mr. K. T. Paul, the capable general secretary of the Young Men's Christian Association in India, has laid the Church under permanent obligation by a series of articles that he published in the *Young Men of India* on the organizations of various Indian sects. In these religious organizations we find the

genius of the Indian people and their ability to organize their religious life in such a way that it not only appealed to the people but kept alive among them the things that they counted dear. If the western church modeled its religious organizations according to the political organizations that were in power at the time of the Church's infancy, and again at the time of the Church's reorganization after the Reformation, why should the Indian church not use the forms that have proved themselves valuable in the religious life of that country? All of which simply means that the Indian asks that he be given the opportunity to think this whole matter through and be allowed to use the principal of the first council—"It seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us."

Another matter that is revealing itself in vital force in India to-day is the fact that those that are most concerned in the winning of India are realizing that the essential thing in the life of the Church as well as in the life of the individual is that there shall be a real experience at the bottom of every form and doctrine. Though many may contend for an objective reality apart from individual experience, many others are feeling that, after all is said and done, no one's religion can be a vital force in his own life unless there is in it a vital experience of reality. The fact of the real presence of the living Christ in such experience seems to be the important element, and many are arguing that that, and that alone, is the important matter. Where men are in relation with the living Christ, and are finding life in that fellowship, all that is essential is present. And there are men of that kind outside of the Church in India to-day. The Church as it exists at present seems to them too much a western institution, with too much emphasis on things that are not vital objects of experience and, hence, though in living fellowship with the living Christ, they do not feel able to join with those who insist on externals that may at some time or other have been of value, but which to them to-day seem to be of minor importance, if not valueless.

All this points to the necessity of having representatives of all nations coming together in conference to tell each other of the things that they find of real value in the Christian life. A united Church must find room for all. There will be much diversity of thought and life. There will be a richness not experienced in the life of any one section of the Church. And thus the Kingdom of God will again stand forth before the whole world as one Body, with one Lord, and with a brotherhood of believers that will embrace men of every race and every tongue. This will call for much charity, and for much sacrifice. But it will be worth the price. The question is are we willing to pay the price, are we willing to sell all we have, in order that the world may possess this priceless treasure?

JOHN J. BANNINGA.

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING

The Need of Unity

It is by no means wholly unsatisfactory that progress to ward reunion is slow. Much as we may regret it, the reuniting of different religious bodies whose separation is marked by many bitter memories is pre-eminently a matter where slowness is a correlative of sureness. Suspicions on both sides need allaying, the ignorance that comes of years of estrangement takes long to remove and, even when friendly and understanding contact is established, the deep-lying differences that proceed from the differing approaches to the central problem of religion have to be resolved, and not slurred over. Undue haste would only result in disaster. A formula of concord that did not express the practical unanimity of all the parties concerned would merely be the occasion of fresh divisions.

But if rash methods of adjustment would merely erect new obstructions to reunion, serious obstacles to progress are to be found in two types of thought on the subject which exercise an inhibitory influence on the efforts now being made. They are the survivals of an earlier day; they no longer correspond with the facts; but none the less they are still capable of confusing the issue and diverting useful energy into profitless channels. The first type of thought that we have in mind is that which regards the members of the Free Churches as nonconforming members of the Church of England. It is an attitude which was popular during the nineteenth century among those to whom the idea of a national church was the dominant consideration. They clung to the principles laid down by Hooker, and blinded themselves to the real facts of the situation. They received a certain encouragement from the common practice of Methodists, many of whom were fond of maintaining that they had never left the Church of England. But it was even amongst them more of a friendly gesture or a pious fancy than a solid reality. Methodists might go to chapel in the morning and to church in the evening or *vice versa;* but, as Frederick Denison Maurice pointed out long ago, the system of Methodism is essentially extra-national. It exists to assert

its independence of the national church, and to proclaim the importance of its world-wide mission of conversion. It is this inherent quality which has made Methodism so powerful and closely knit an organization all over the English-speaking world. The Baptist and the Congregationalist, by the nature of their tenets, were less liable to adopt this particular type of thought. As time has gone on, the notion has increasingly lost whatever correspondence with fact it may once have possessed. The Free Churches have become increasingly churches, each conscious of its own corporate mind and particular mission. When they have desired a larger unity they have turned to a unity of all Free Churches, expressing as a whole a distinct tradition and one conspicuously different from the sacramental and hierarchical conceptions of the Anglican communion. Nonconformist is a term that has ceased to have a definite meaning. Progress is only possible when these facts are recognized. It has been achieved at Lambeth because both sides have recognized that what was going forward was negotiation between real self-governing churches, not between the separate members of one church.

The other type of thought that hinders all efforts after a better understanding between Christians is that which regards corporate reunion as a chimæra if not a blunder. The view that opposes unity of spirit to unity of organization avoids the hard and painful thought which is necessary to true unity among the followers of Christ, by acquiescence in a mere sentiment. It evacuates the profound meaning of "spirit" in the New Testament and falls short of the splendid vision contained in the Scriptures. As Canon Lacey writes, in the most important contribution that has been made to the whole question of recent years, *The One Body and the One Spirit,* "Saint Paul does not mean by the unity of the Spirit a generally diffused sense of good-will, or an identity of purpose underlying superficial antagonisms." He means a synthesis of truths difficult to hold together, and an incorporation of strong-thinking and deep-feeling men with all their rich variety into a corporate whole.

There is a further reason for seeking a visible unity beyond those that can be adduced from the evidences of the Divine purpose in the New Testament. Men are hungry for peace today. They look eagerly for the signs of a power that can bring the contending forces within a nation, and the bitter suspicions and jealousies that separate people from people and race from race, into a co-operative whole. The Church is charged with

the mission of peace. Its voice is silenced while Christians are seen to be incapable of realizing that brotherhood which the precepts of their religion so plainly demand. It would no doubt be a gain if it could be shown that different Christian bodies had at least learned to be friendly. It would be an even greater thing if a federation of these bodies could be achieved. But not until the underlying unity of all Christian people can be made patent to every age will the angelic message with which the Church is charged ring through the earth as a trumpet call for peace.

[From *The Guardian,* London.]

Not Enough to Desire Union; One Must Work for it

If you really desire to do something worth while for the union of Christendom, it is not enough for you who are Catholics to desire union and to work for it. You must find others who will work toward the same end, and you must find them among our separated brethren. They are to be found. All over the world there are Christians who are hungering for union. To find them out, and to attach them to yourselves in all confidence and loyalty, must be your first step. It is the best way for discovering what the difficulties really are, and for learning how the difficulties may be overcome. You can in this way create in the different churches groups whose members will have the same desire as yourselves; and through them and through you the points of common ground will be extended. In our own matter, if we have been able to produce results that are worth while, then next to God we owe our success to the friendship that has united Lord Halifax and myself.

[From a lecture by the Abbé Portal to the students of the Benedictine College, Louvain, in *The Catholic Times,* London.]

Faith and Order

The bishop of Manchester drew an important distinction, in a recent address, when he said that he found himself quite unable to agree with the proposition that, as foundations of the Church, Faith and Order stood on a level, and he proceeded to show how important was the bearing on reunion of a discrimi-

nation between the relative importance of these two things. Unity of Faith, he said, is absolutely essential; Order is subordinate, and must be judged by its power to subserve the ends of faith. That, of course, does not mean that Order is unimportant. In the human world that we know, excellent principles often remain unfruitful through failure to consider how best to embody them in concrete form. The helpless idealist must accept some at any rate of the responsibility for the world's woes.

That the bishop was right in drawing attention to the usefulness of the distinction is shown by the record of the Joint Conference held at Lambeth Palace between the years 1921 and 1925, which has been published by the Oxford Press. In this small but significant volume the present results of the conference have been gathered in a convenient and cheap form by the Dean of Canterbury and the Secretary of the Federal Council of Evangelical Free Churches, the Rev. W. L. Robertson. A study of the documents—and it is to be hoped that they will be widely and carefully studied—sets at rest a misconception that has arisen in some quarters. The representatives of the Anglican Communion and of the Free Churches, who have been meeting at Lambeth at intervals during these four years, have not been discussing any scheme of union; they have been exploring possibilities, considering difficulties, and making suggestions as to conceivable methods of dealing with those difficulties at some later date, when the mind of Christian England is awake to a lively and intelligent interest in a problem that is too little heeded by the ordinary church member. It is impossible adequately to summarize all that took place in one short article. The amount is too large, and the hopeful change that has been wrought is too far-reaching. But certain elements stand out and deserve wide recognition.

The first of these is certainly the supremacy of Faith over Order to which the bishop of Manchester referred. The idea, entirely congenial to the first ages of Christianity, is implicit in the Lambeth Appeal to all Christian people—"We acknowledge all those who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ, and have been baptized into the name of the Holy Trinity, as sharing with us membership in the universal Church of Jesus Christ, which is his Body." Unity of faith is explicitly recognized in the report accepted by the whole body of Anglicans and Free Churchmen who have been meeting at Lambeth as an essential element in a united Church; this unity is seen to involve an

objective standard of truth; and further "the creed commonly called Nicene" is acknowledged to be a sufficient statement of this corporate faith. These facts are in themselves of the first importance. The necessity of unity of faith had already been discovered by the Federal Council of the Free Churches. So keenly did they feel the need of such a basis of fellowship and co-operation that they drew up in 1917 a "Declaratory Statement of Common Faith and Practice" which abundantly proves how much the Anglican and Free Churches hold in common. Some things would no doubt be differently phrased or emphasized by Anglican writers. But the document is one more proof that the fundamental agreement between Christians is much larger than is generally supposed.

Since there was so large an agreement in matters of Faith, the discussions at Lambeth turned in the main on questions of Order. Here the dominating fact is the general recognition that there is no question of the absorption of one church by another. The ideal that was always kept steadily in view was a united Church of the future, which shall be neither Anglican nor Methodist nor Presbyterian, but one in which the values of each of these systems shall be conserved and flourish. It was in relation to the discussions on Order that the importance of making it subordinate to Faith appears. If the Anglicans had approached the Free Churches on the basis that the episcopal system was the only one that constituted a church as a church at all, there would have been an end of all discussion. The consequence of following the other and truer path is that the Free Church representative members showed themselves most willing to recognize the value of episcopacy in the church of the future. Next to the recognition of the necessity of unity in Faith and in expression of Faith, this is perhaps the most important result of the discussions. The Joint Conference made it clear that the episcopacy which they contemplated as finding its place in the united Church would, in some ways, work differently from that which at present obtains in the Church of England. It would be a "constitutional" episcopacy, allowing a proper function to the presbyteral and congregational elements of church Order. The Assembly of the Federal Council of the Free Churches laid considerable stress on this point in the resolutions they adopted last September; "the proposal," they said, "must be accepted . . . in its entirety." Not the least interesting section of the proceedings is the memorandum in

which the bishop of Truro and Dr. Garvie outline a scheme whereby these elements can be reconciled.

The much canvassed question of re-ordination or ordination *sub conditione* looms large in some of these documents. It is important to remember that, if such usages are found necessary, it will, if the vision is realized, only be as a temporary measure during an interim period. No ultimate question is raised, but one that none the less is immediately of great practical importance. The difficulty of arriving at any clear view afforded a needed opportunity to pause. Much has been accomplished. It is no exaggeration to say that the whole scene has changed. But what has been done is certainly not understood by the rank and file in any of the churches. It would be dangerous for the leaders to get too far ahead. What is needed now is that in every ruri-decanal chapter and conference throughout the country these documents should be carefully explained and studied.

[From *The Guardian,* London.]

Proposals for Unity in India

THE negotiations for the union of churches in South India have reached a very interesting point. They are important because, of all the union negotiations in which the Anglican Church is involved, these are the most likely to go through.

THE CHURCHES NEGOTIATING

The negotiations are for a South India Union. They arose out of a meeting of South Indian ministers in 1919. The movement represents the desire of the Christians belonging to the Dravidian peoples in South India to be united in one church. Each of the three churches now in negotiation has a considerable number of members. The dioceses of our own "Church of England in India," which are primarily concerned — *viz.,* Madras, Dornakal, Tinnevelly, and Travancore—contain 300,000, of whom 60,000 are Europeans. The South India United Church is a union which was formed about sixteen years ago between the Christians of six Scottish, English, and American Presbyterian and Congregationalist missions, and one German Evangelical body. The United Church numbers about 240,000. The Wesleyan Church in South India numbers about 60,000.

The principal bonds which draw these people together are the bond of blood and a close social and spiritual intercourse of years. The Dravidian peoples speak four languages, but they are sister and cousin languages, like Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, and French. We are familiar with the sense of natural sympathy and fellow feeling between the Latin peoples in Europe. From this we can easily understand the sympathetic unity which exists between the Dravidian people. These ethical facts are reinforced by even more important social and spiritual ones. A large number of the Christians of South India live in close proximity to one another, a quarter of a million of them in three contiguous civil districts. Marriage alliances still follow the old caste divisions independent of the Christian denominations. The educated men from Tinnevelly are to be found all over South India in the churches now negotiating union, and whether as ministers or schoolmasters or government servants they impart an intellectual unity to this body of Christians. Lastly, there has long been constant spiritual intercourse in conventions, retreats, etc., which have brought together the keenest members of the churches in some of their deepest experiences. Thus it is not only the call of the blood, but also the call of a common spirit which gives to these union negotiations a reality and an urgency which is not apparent in any European unity negotiations. Indeed, the Indians have more than once assured us that if these joint conferences were abandoned they would have conferences by themselves and quickly conclude a union.

The Method of Negotiation

The method of negotiation is that officially selected members of the churches meet from time to time, not as plenipotentiaries, but as a joint committee for discussions, and refer their results to the churches which sent them for approval or otherwise—the suggestion which we desire to communicate through you to the church at home is a suggestion of this Joint Committee, framed last February. It is a suggestion about the vexed question of the existing ministries.

The Points of Agreement Reached

In order to judge correctly the suggestion now made it is essential to bear in mind the points of agreement already reached. We have agreed from the first that we are not going

to found a new church, but "so to organize the Church in India that it shall give the Indian expression of the spirit, the thought, and the life of the Church universal." We have agreed in much the same way as the Lambeth Joint Committees are agreed about the Holy Scriptures, the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, and the historic and constitutional episcopate. This historic episcopate is accepted as a fact, ancient, enduring, extensive, and the only probable basis for a corporate reunion of Christendom. We agree to use the historic episcopate and to recognize that we have different theories of its meaning. Further, we are agreed that after the union has taken full effect, all ordinations will be in the hands of the episcopate. Still further we have reached a most important agreement about the meaning of ordination which has been formulated as follows:

"In ordination God, in answer to the prayer of his Church, bestows on and assures to him whom He has called such grace as is appropriate and sufficient for that ministry, which grace, if humbly used, will enable the minister to perform the same."

Difficulty of Existing Ministers

We have found, like the Lambeth Joint Committee, that the existing ministers and ministries form the most difficult point with which we have to deal. In South India the Joint Committee drew up a service of mutual commission in 1923. This was considered at the request of the Metropolitan by a number of theologians and scholars of the English Church. The form drawn up was generally not approved. It was held by almost all those who were consulted that it would not be accepted by English Churchmen as conveying a real ordination. Our friends in the Joint Committee in South India stated at Trichinopoly that, if it were altered so as to achieve that object, they could not agree to it. The proposal fails, on the ground which the Anglican members at Lambeth considered to be the great objection to it—*viz.*, such mutual commissioning would be understood in different ways by those who gave and those who received it in every way.

The failure of this proposal is due mainly to the conviction on the part of many that, having been really ordained by God, they would commit an act of disloyalty and sacrilege by submitting to another ordination of any sort. This conviction makes even ordination *sub conditione* unacceptable to them.

The New Solution

For reasons which were very carefully stated at the Joint Committee, which I will give in a moment, the negotiations agreed to a new solution. It is to recognize the existing ministers of those churches which are joining with us, *after the union,* as ministers of the word and sacraments in the united Church.

We find that there is an opinion on all sides that sudden and general interchange of ministers and congregations would lead to disquietude, and might tend to confusion and fear. We, therefore, propose to agree to a general rule, that "no minister ordained before the union will minister temporarily in any church or congregation without the consent of the parish minister and the congregation, or will be transferred to any new congregation without the consent of that congregation and the bishop."

We consider that, to meet an obvious practical difficulty about missionaries, this principle should be extended, during a period of fifty years after the union, to ministers of the churches in the West which founded the missions whose labours have under God produced the South Indian churches concerned in the union, if those ministers "are willing to make the same declarations with regard to acceptance of the faith and constitution of the church as are required from persons about to be ordained or employed for the first time in the united church." We propose, however, that those who make the union should declare it to be their intention that after the close of that period no one will minister in that church unless he has received regular episcopal ordination.

This solution has no value if it is a mere concession for the purpose of concluding a bargain. We believe, on the contrary, that it is justified by a reasonable interpretation of history. We put this interpretation before our Free Church friends at Trichinopoly. They hastened to assure us that they rejected our view of history, while accepting our practical proposals. I state the historical argument again here. We wish it to be weighed by our fellow-churchmen before they agree or disagree with our proposal. They may be able to help us so to improve it as to gain the acceptance of the Free Churches.

Our Solution Tested by History

There is no doubt about two phenomena in early church history. Ordination was performed by the apostles, then by

those whom they commissioned to perform it; then it passed to the bishops. The celebration of the Eucharist belonged to the apostles and the presbyters, and then to the bishops and the presbyters. By the end of the third century these customs had gained a conscious acceptance which admitted of no exceptions. All the members of the Body of Christ, St. Paul had said, have not the same function. The process described above is the process by which the Body as a whole became conscious of the appropriate functions of some of its most important members, *i. e.,* the orders of the ministry. The exceptions to the above-mentioned customs, which may appear in the earliest centuries, are comparable to those experiments which a child makes with its members before it has learned their functions. But when it has realized that feet are made to walk with and hands to handle with, it uses those members for these purposes always.

We do not deny either the abuses which preceded the Reformation in the Western Church, or the gains on many sides of the life of the Church which resulted from the Reformation. But one immense loss resulted from it. Western Christianity ceased to be a body. It ceased to have the primary characteristic of a body, the well-known and acknowledged differentiation of function between its members. The churches of the Reformation felt a need of ministers and a desire to preserve the two sacraments of the Gospel. Holding strongly, as we do, that God's first plan for the body of Christ was that which the development of the early Church evidences, we see in the ministers of the Protestant churches and their ministration of sacraments the grace of God coming forward to succor them in their difficulties. It is especially easy to hold this about the present and many previous generations which have no personal responsibility for the separations of Christendom. Thus we submit that these ministers are really ministers of God, and that his grace has reached men through the sacraments they minister; and yet the post-Reformation ministries are not God's original design—his first thoughts—for the Church. He raised them up to meet circumstances which were not part of his design, but arose from the sins of his children.

St. Augustine argued about the Donatist sacraments that God really worked in them, but that they had no beneficial effect on those who received them so long as they remained outside the unity of the church—once they were joined to that unity, the sacraments which they had received began to have their

full efficiency. Without endorsing the form of his argument, we believe that in our present proposals we are adopting his principle. We recognize the action of God in these ministries in separation; we recognize the ministries themselves after union. Again, we take up another point made by that great man. The determining factor is the desire to return into one body in love. This desire already changes our feelings toward men who no longer wish to work in competition against us, but in unity with us. When the desire is consummated in the union of the churches, the grace of love gaining new scope from that union completes the grace which God gave to the ministers in their separation.

How Such Proposals Should Be Judged

We ask for a discussion of these proposals in your columns, partly that we may know the mind of the Church of England, partly that we may be helped to improve them. At the same time we ask that they should not be considered from a party point of view. We cannot believe that any light will be thrown on this matter by trying to calculate whether Protestants or Catholics will gain by such a union. We are trying to make this union in order that Jesus Christ may have on earth a Body more like that which we know He desires. Given that Body, given its increased opportunities of mutual intercourse, understanding, and co-operation, the truth will prevail in it more firmly, more generally, and even more quickly than in our separated churches. Any party which believes itself to be in possession and in charge of valuable truth, will, in proportion to the intensity of its faith, rejoice in the new opportunity which union will give for the spreading of its view of the truth. We ask your readers then to put aside all party considerations, and to tell us whether they think that we have come nearer to perceiving what is God's mind about divided Christendom and its ministries, and whether the way which we suggest of effecting a reconciliation and a corporate union is the way which is most likely to please Him.

I am sir,

Your obedient servant,
Edwin James Bombay.

[From the Bishop of Bombay in *The Canadian Churchman.*]

The Unity Movement in India as Seen by an Episcopal Editor

The bishop of Bombay has addressed a letter to Anglican newspapers in England and its dominions and colonies but, apparently, not to those in the United States. Certain negotiations looking toward church unity are under way in India and he desires that these be made known and discussed in the columns of each of these papers, "partly that we may know the mind of the Church of England, partly that we may be helped to improve them." He asks rightly that they be not discussed "from a party point of view," and he "cannot believe that any light will be thrown on this matter by trying to calculate whether Protestants or Catholics will gain by such a union."

Not desiring to submit advice unasked, we shall review the plan unfolded by the bishop, not in any sense that our views may be pressed upon him, but because American churchmen will not be willing to be negligible factors in a plan that might conceivably afford the greatest embarrassment throughout the Anglican communion.

The bishop's plan of sending this material for discussion through the church newspapers instead of through the episcopate is unique. We grant that there is something to be said for it, if that plan be considered simply in the interest of preliminary publicity and as drawing out discussion. We shall hope, however, that, even if it could be assumed that the plan for reunion might be generally indorsed by this newspaper referendum, the church in India might esteem itself morally estopped from adopting so momentous a plan for change without first securing the approval of the Anglican communion as a whole. The mind of that communion, we may point out, cannot be wholly ascertained by inquiry as to "the mind of the Church of England." That so constructive a thinker as the bishop of Bombay should be so narrowly provincial as to be unable to see beyond nationalistic borders on a matter of this sort affords disappointment at the outset. The church of the Anglican communion in the United States is not a negligible factor in determining whether a hitherto uniform policy among Anglican churches relative to treatment of non-episcopal ministries should now be altered by a single missionary church in India. We hope that, at least, no such revolutionary proceeding might be attempted without consultation of the Lambeth Conference.

The essence of the proposed plan seems to be this: The South India United Church—representing Presbyterian, Congregational, and German Evangelical missions—would agree

with the Church of England in India that, after a fixed date for union, "all ordinations will be in the hands of the episcopate." The sentence is vague and ambiguous at the very point at which vagueness and ambiguity should have been avoided. We shall assume that this means that all ordinations shall be performed exclusively by bishops of the Anglican line after the given date.

From that date, for a period of fifty years, the ministers of all the contracting parties shall be recognized "as ministers of the word and sacraments in the united Church." Thus episcopally and non-episcopally ordained ministers would be on a parity for half a century. After that, the ministers who had entered into the arrangement having passed away, it is assumed that only episcopally ordained ministers would remain.

During that fifty years of transition there would, however, be the limitation in the actual working of the system that "no minister ordained before the union will minister temporarily in any church or congregation without the consent of the parish minister and the congregation, or will be transferred to any new congregation without the consent of that congregation and the bishop."

Would that proviso safeguard the congregations of the church during the transition period? It would not, since any "minister and congregation" of the church would be at liberty to disregard the requirement for episcopal ordination in connection with any "temporary" appointee, and any bishop and congregation could disregard it in connection with any permanent appointment. Episcopal ordination would, therefore, rest simply on the preference of particular congregations and individuals.

Of course if episcopal ordination is simply a matter of preference, this system would work well enough. But the curious thing to us is that anyone should fail to see that either it is essential or that it is unreasonable for us to lay such stress upon it as a condition precedent to unity. What must Presbyterians and Congregationalists think of us when we lay such great stress upon episcopal ordination, and then consent to a system that falls short of actually requiring it in every instance?

The real fact is that it is inviting misunderstanding when we speak of "episcopal ordination" in this connection at all. If we would make ourselves clear in the matter, and substitute an end in place of a means, we would say to our friends outside our communion: Our position is that in the church we invariably need *priests,* in order that they may validly celebrate

Holy Communion and pronounce absolution. Has your form of ordination produced priests? The inevitable answer of Presbyterians and Congregationalists must be that it has not; they have not intended that it should. Very well; our formularies show beyond a shadow of doubt our conviction that only priests may perform these offices; and Presbyterian and Congregationalist formularies equally show their conviction that priests have not been created by virtue of their respective forms of ordination. Here, then, may be a conflict not of preference but of principles. In a united church, will all factors agree that priests alone shall perform these offices? Or shall we recede from that principle, upon which the Catholic Church has acted during the entire course of its history?

This is the issue. We have only beclouded it these many years past when we have insisted upon episcopal ordination while giving no reason for the insistence. Episcopal ordination is not an end in itself; it is a means—the only means of which we know—to produce priests.

Thus the issue with sectarianism is not over the historic episcopate, but over the priesthood.

We do not forget that it is easy to be over-dogmatic in asserting the necessity of a priesthood for the valid consecration of the Eucharist and the authoritative pronouncement of absolution, or for the necessity that only a bishop may ordain a priest. This is not a matter of revelation. It is, rather, a deduction as to our Lord's will that the Church has made from the beginning and a requirement of the Church in all ages. It rests upon that unanimous agreement of the Church during the whole period of its unbroken unity, continuing in both East and West after these had parted company.

Other Christian bodies have departed from that unanimous requirement and set up non-priestly and non-episcopal ministries of their own. To Almighty God, not to us, these are answerable. It may be true, as the bishop of Bombay says, that "these ministers are really ministers of God"; but they very clearly are not priests. It may be that God "raised them up to meet circumstances which were not part of his design but arose from the sins of his children." We do not sit in judgment upon them. But it is clear at least that whatever necessity for such a ministry there may conceivably have been once, there is none now.

What we do maintain is that we, who have always retained the apostolic ministry, in accordance with the unbroken prac-

tice of the Catholic Church, cannot make ourselves parties to an arrangement whereby, even for half a century, it should be assumed that these newer ministries are equivalent to the historic priesthood. How do we know that they are? What reason have we to suppose that they are? The Church of England, whether in India or in England, has no authority either to determine the question, or to treat it as negligible, or to adopt a practice that is contrary to the unbroken practice of the greater church of which she is only a part.

Even more serious is the fact that, after union on these lines should be effected, it still does not appear that the Protestant bodies in India have accepted the priesthood, that they expect or desire their ministers afterward ordained to be priests, or that they would preserve their new priestly ministry inviolate from non-priests who might and would go out to India from home lands.

In short, in talking with them about episcopal ordination, it seems not to have been made clear to them that—unless the ordinal itself should be altered in connection with this plan—the ministers afterward to be ordained would be priests, while those previously ordained were not and never purported to be. Priests and non-priests would be inextricably mixed up together in a ministry that was neither the one thing nor the other.

Are these Indian bodies prepared to supplant their ministry with a priesthood, whether quickly, after the precedent of 1662, or gradually, after the plan now proposed? In our judgment the feasibility of any union with "the churches of the Reformation" hinges upon the answer to that question. If they are, a way for unity can be discovered, although we do not think this Indian plan satisfactory for the purpose. If they are not, it would be highly culpable on our part to extend to them, under the guise of giving episcopal ordination, a priesthood that they do not want and would not understand that they were receiving.

So, though we are not of the "Church of England" and our opinion has not been asked, we feel bound to express dissent from the plan submitted to that church by the bishop of Bombay. In ignoring the whole question of the priesthood as he seems to have done throughout these negotiations, he has vitiated the whole proceedings. He has created a condition by which, if his plan were accepted by all parties—which is unthinkable—there would inevitably be charges preferred of bad faith when it should finally appear that we were foisting—by

trickery it might be said—*priests* upon people who were not asking for priests.

"Episcopal ordination" is an ambiguous term. Let it be frankly avowed in every possible conference looking toward unity, that our only object in insisting that only bishops shall ordain is that thereby priests will be created.

Let us at least be perfectly frank.

[From *The Living Church,* Milwaukee, Wis.]

Protestant Orders and Sacraments

TURNING, first, to the question of Orders, we find on the Catholic side a clear-cut and rigid system of priestly authority and privilege. It is based on a theory of apostolic succession, mediated through the hands of bishops, whereby the person thus ordained receives from God the grace of the Order conferred on him. This enables him to celebrate valid sacraments and to perform all priestly functions. Now it is, to say the least of it, very doubtful whether any such theory of succession and transmission can be justified from the New Testament or the practice of the early church. Still less does it appear there that the grace of God can only be mediated through the duly prepared hands. The Protestant view of Orders lays no such stress on these authorized channels. A man is made a minister by the call of God and his conscious response to it. The church then recognizes and ratifies the call and sets the man apart, giving him authority to minister within its borders. The Catholic practice seems to limit the grace of God by the great importance it attaches to the human media. There is something inevitably mechanical about Orders transmissible only in a certain way. The Protestant position, on the other hand, is to make God the sole source and fount of grace, and its transmission to the individual immediate. All that men can do is humbly to recognize the fact of the Divine call, and admit those whom they are justified in regarding as thus endowed to the ministry of the word and sacraments.

The Catholic view of Orders which regards them as a means of conferring or transmitting grace governs their whole ecclesiastical system. It represents the acutest point of difference between Romans and Anglicans, and between Anglicans and Free Churchmen. Romans deny the validity of Anglicans and

Anglicans those of the Free Churches. Those who stress the term "validity" seem to mean by it a mysterious and quasi-magical power with which the priest is invested and with which he is able to endow both men and things. This power is no doubt supposed to be obtained from God, but only on condition of the performance of certain ceremonial rites.

The importance of this is very marked in relation to the sacraments. According to the extreme Catholic view, baptism by a duly ordained priest has an actual power of regeneration. By the use of the consecrated water in the name of the Trinity, the status of the child in God's sight is radically changed. The extreme Protestant position, on the other hand, makes baptism a purely symbolical act. It effects no change in the child. But it recognizes the fact that the child is among those for whom Christ died, and it pledges church and parents alike to train the child in the Christian faith. It is an act both of dedication and consecration. Between these extremes there is room for many shades of opinion, but they cannot blur the fundamental distinction between an act of generation and one of consecration.

The same contrast is even more painfully apparent in regard to the communion of the Lord's Supper. Here, again, in the extreme Catholic view the whole efficacy of the rite depends on its being duly administered, and that again produces such a change in the elements as to secure, or at least facilitate, a living communion with Jesus Christ present on the altar. He is held to be present there in actual material form. As a recent Anglo-Catholic writer says, the body present on the altar "is the same as that which was on the Cross." In the service this body is sacrificed again for the sins of men, and brings cleansing and sanctification to those who partake of it. The change in the elements is produced by the miracle of consecration, and this can only be performed by the duly ordained priest.

Protestant views of the sacrament vary between a bare commemoration service and a service in which Christ is held to be truly present and truly imparting Himself to men. The corporate faith of the participants secures for them this boon, and the symbolism of the bread and wine brings it home to them with a reality and assurance which no other service gives. Meeting as they do in humility, penitence, and adoring trust, men find that they truly meet with their Lord, and, feeding on Him by faith, have nourishment for their souls. Here the operative agents are the faith of those who receive and the Holy Spirit of God taking of the things of Christ and giving them

to men. Between this purely spiritual view of the sacrament, which is common to all Protestants, and the more or less mechanical interpretation of Catholicism there is a great gulf fixed.

So it has come about that this most sacred and intimate rite of the Christian faith is the point at which the divisions of Christendom are most manifest. The effect on Protestants has not been good. In strong reaction against what they cannot but regard as the magical and even pagan accretions of the Catholic rite, Protestants generally have tended sometimes to neglect it, and sometimes to put upon it too bald and lifeless an interpretation. It would, perhaps, be well for the Protestantism of the future to make more of symbolism in religion, and, while losing nothing of the belief in the sacramental character of all life, to find its highest expression in this ordinance. There can be no doubt that rightly used it meets men's needs and quickens their spiritual sense as no other form of worship does. By stressing the purely spiritual aspect of the service and showing how potent it can be for Christian living, Protestants may do a great deal toward delivering the Church from the bondage of superstition and bringing it out into that clearer and rarer atmosphere where spiritual things are spiritually discerned.

Protestantism Free and Adaptable

There are other respects also in which Protestants may do much to meet religious needs which seem at present to be more adequately met by Catholicism. With the Catholic system of compulsory auricular confession and priestly absolution, Protestants can have no sort of sympathy. But that is not to say that they might not organize themselves much better than they have ever yet done for dealing with sick souls. There are vast numbers of people who are theologically uninstructed and spiritually immature, and who easily go astray for lack of some guiding hand. To deal with such people wisely requires great tact, wide experience and a working knowledge of the more pathological aspects of religious psychology. That all ministers should receive definite training for such work goes without saying. Voluntary confession to some one who can deal with sins and errors with the authority that comes of sympathy and knowledge is a most helpful and healing discipline. The Protestant churches should be able to supply the need without any of the drawbacks which inevitably attend the Catholic system.

As we have already indicated, the Protestant position, broadly speaking, rests on the New Testament presentation of Christianity. It stands for the right of the individual to have access to God for himself, and it finds its two foci in the free grace of God and the saving faith of men. It can live only in an atmosphere of liberty, and it must face boldly all the risks and adventures which this involves. It is essentially spiritual in its requirements, its outlook and its methods. For that very reason it is not an easy form of faith, and it tends to make demands of men which are almost greater than flesh and blood can bear. Catholicism, in all its modern forms, is essentially of the nature of a reaction. It lives on the weakness of human nature, and provides it with the props and refuges which the present distress makes necessary. But there is a better way, and that the Protestantism of the future must gird itself to provide. It has the inestimable advantage of having its face set to the future rather than to the past, and of being free to meet the new requirements of each new age. If Catholicism has some advantage in antiquity and power of discipline, Protestantism has far more in its freedom and capacity for adaptation; only it must be true to its heritage and suffer nothing to interfere with its power of free development. There can be no real progress in religion without freedom, and in religion, as in everything else, progress is necessary to life.

Protestantism Alone Can Satisfy Unrest

The Protestant interpretation of Christianity, with its belief in freedom of thought and its dependence on the leading of the Spirit of God, is the only one which remains loyal to the example, teaching and intention of its Founder. It is true that the Protestant churches have not always realized this, and have suffered grievously from the stereotyping of dogma, and from a certain rigidity of ecclesiastical form. They have had, too, the defects of their qualities, and have sunk at times into a latitudinarian apathy which has been equally fatal. But they have now an unprecedented opportunity. There is a spirit of unrest and inquiry abroad which they alone are in a position to meet and satisfy. What men require to-day is freedom to work out their own salvation, both intellectually and practically. They need guidance and teaching, but it must be given to them as to responsible and thinking beings. It must appeal to reason and be founded on experience, and be translated into

language which they can understand. The Protestant church of the future must be above all things a teaching church, and must bring out of the treasury of God's revelation things new and old. The demands of man's religious nature were never more insistent and, perhaps, never more difficult to satisfy. No mere repetition of ancient formulas will meet the case. Only the truth will set men free, and it must be put before them in terms which will at once appeal to and satisfy the deepest chords of their being.

So Protestantism must have as its gospel a living message from God to men delivered directly to the individual and expecting from him a personal response. Not until Protestantism has recovered the apostolic intensity of conviction and fervor of appeal, and is prepared to meet men on their own ground and speak intimately to their needs, will it be able to fulfil its mission and become a living witness of God's word.

[From Principal W. B. Selbie in *The Continent,* New York.]

Last Letters of Cardinal Mercier to Archbishop of Canterbury

A VERY fine piece of Christian statesmanship has recently been provided by the publication of two letters by Lord Halifax in *The Times,* from the late Cardinal Mercier to the Archbishop of Canterbury. I append them here:

MALINES, OCTOBER 25, 1925.

My dear Lord,—As soon as I received your letter of August 1st, I made a point of acknowledging it at once, but I found myself compelled to ask for some delay in order to examine its contents. This delay has been prolonged far beyond my expectations. Being accustomed as you are to the difficulties of a large administration, I trust you will excuse me and forgive this apparent carelessness.

When I first read it, your letter caused me a certain uneasiness. I was not sure that I had grasped its inner meaning. The document was inspired by an unaltered good will, all appreciations of the past were encouraging, but reflections on the present situation and on future developments seemed to betray a shaken confidence. This was not surprising, since, in such a long protracted effort as our own, if the goal remains the same, the means to reach it vary according to circumstances and raise new problems at every step.

As our exchanges of views are pursued within our meetings the line of demarcation between the articles on which agreement existed or has been achieved, and the articles about which certain divergencies still exist, become more and more distinct, the difficulties in the way of final success loom larger on the horizon, and the reasons for hoping seem less convincing.

When, on the other hand, we listen to the voice of our followers outside our meetings, we notice a restlessness which it is not within our power to

appease, and it may be that we, I mean your grace and myself, feel some anxiety and weariness which are not always easy to dispel.

Among our Roman Catholics, this restlessness assumes two different aspects. Some of them, full of enthusiasm and sympathy for our cause, complain of our apparent dilatoriness and of a silence which seems to them unduly prolonged. They are inclined to imagine that the problem of reunion being stated, like a theorem of geometry, its affirmative or negative solution ought to be reached immediately. If the worst came to the worst, they say a majority vote would put an end to all hesitations. They would like to see the Malines conversations proceed more quickly, and thus satisfy, without further delay, the curiosity of public opinion. Reunion would be such a beautiful and edifying spectacle that one could not provide too early to the religious-minded the comfort which they would derive from it.

Others, on the contrary, haunted by the policy of "all or nothing," consider only the final result, exaggerate purposely the difficulties which must be conquered before reaching it, and undervalue the supreme part played by grace in the evolution of spiritual life. Relying only upon themselves and upon the knowledge of their own weakness, they would readily abandon an attempt in which, it is true, they have never placed any confidence, which, at the bottom of their hearts they perhaps never favoured, and for the success of which they perhaps never prayed.

Your grace must, no doubt, meet with the same restlessness on the part of inveterate optimists and obstinate pessimists among your own flock; they wish to obtain from us a sudden solution, and, if they could, they would urge us to end the matter promptly.

Do you not think it would be weakness on our part if we gave way to these solicitations? We have responsibilities which our followers do not share and do not always understand. Our situation imposes upon us the duty to consider the general situation from a higher standpoint, according to deeper supernatural standards. The direction of consciences entrusted to us allows us to act with authority.

Your grace's letter mentions certain declarations which ought to be made, certain statements in which the points agreed upon by the two sides should be definitely outlined and in which the points still under discussion should be recalled. I eagerly accept this proposal, and am ready to place it on the agenda of our next meeting, which might take place, according to the wish expressed by Lord Halifax, during the first fortnight of January, 1926.

I understand that two statements ought to be prepared, the first on the conclusions already reached, the second on disputable points which have been partially considered or on new subjects which, according to the wish of one or both sides, ought still to be placed on the agenda.

This comparative survey would show, I believe, that not only have our meetings brought hearts together, which is already a very appreciable result, but that they have also on important points harmonized our thoughts and achieved progress in agreement.

The first statement on common conclusions might be developed in more explicit form or be published in a reduced form. It would be a happy means of maintaining the religious interest of our respective flocks. According to my humble opinion, however, it would be inopportune to publish the statement on disputable points. Negative conclusions, whatever they may be, would provoke polemics in the press, reawake secular animosities, and accentuate divisions, thus harming the cause to which we have resolved to devote ourselves.

Faithful to our original purpose, we must bring to light progressively whatever favours reunion, and set aside or defer whatever stands in the way. Our original intention was not to examine, within a set time, a few questions of theology, exegesis, or history, with the hope of adding a chapter of apologetics or controversies to the scientific or religious works of our

predecessors. On the contrary, we met face to face like men of good will and sincere believers, alarmed by the confusion of opinions and the divisions of thought prevailing in modern society, and saddened by the progress of religious indifference and of the materialistic conception of life which follows it. We had in mind the supreme wish for reunion, for unity expressed by our Divine Saviour: "*Ut unum sint*"; "If they only could be one!" We set to work without knowing either when or how this union hoped for by Christ could be realized, but convinced that it could be realized since Christ willed it, and that we had, therefore, each one of us to bring our contribution to its realization. Reunion is not our work and we may be unable to achieve it, but it is within our power, and consequently within our duty to prepare it and pave the way for it.

Was it not for this high purpose that the Lambeth Conference was called together in a spirit of trust in the wisdom and goodness of Divine Providence? Is this not the unique object pursued for more than fifty years by our dear and revered colleague who devotes with such admirable zeal, his time, his strength, and his heart to the cause of reunion?

I seem to hear the revered dean of Wells addressing us in such moving words, at the close of our first meeting: "For four centuries Anglicans and Roman Catholics were only aware of their antagonisms and divisions; they have met for the first time in order better to understand each other, to remove the misunderstandings which estrange them, to draw nearer to the goal so wished for by every one—reunion." When the revered dean uttered these moving words he did not merely address our small, exclusive group, but the mass of believers which we knew were behind us and whose perseverant faith in Christ and in the Church is the object of our constant care and anxiety.

So far as I am concerned, it is in this light of apostleship that I have looked upon my contribution to these conversations from the first day when the revered Lord Halifax and the Abbé Portal expressed the wish that I should join them. When, in January, 1924, I explained to my clergy and to my diocese the part which I had played in our conversations, I dwelt on the same point. I reminded them of the words of Leo XIII: "The great events of history cannot be gauged by human calculations." Foreseeing and fearing their impatience, I recalled to them the teaching of St. Paul on the unique source of the fruitfulness of apostleship: "So then, neither is he that planteth anything, neither he that watereth; but God that giveth the increase," "*Neque qui plantat est aliquid neque qui rigat sed qui incrementum dat, Deus*" (I Cor. III. 7). And I added these words, which I beg leave to repeat here: "You are getting impatient, success is slow to come, your trouble appears wasted. Be on your guard; Nature and her eagerness to mislead you; an effort of charity is never lost."

Reapers of souls, we must sow in the sweat of our brow, mostly in tears, before the hour of reaping strikes. When this blessed hour does strike, another very likely will have filled our place: "*Alius est qui seminat, alius est qui metit*" (St. John IV. 38).

It is in this spirit of Christian patience and supernatural confidence that we shall meet again in January next, content to labour and to sow, leaving to the Holy Spirit and to the working of his grace the choice of the day and the hour for reaping the crop which our humble works and our prayers endeavour to prepare.

For this also, and above all, we must declare; associate ourselves as students, it is true, but our association is chiefly spiritual and joins in common prayer. The knowledge of our mere existence and of our periodical meetings is, for the general public, a constant exhortation to religious thought and collective prayer for reunion.

I am, your grace, your obedient servant,

✠ D. J. Card. Mercier, Arch. of Malines.

The Second Letter

The second letter was written shortly before the Cardinal's death.

Brussels, January 21, 1926.

My Lord,—In the trial which it has pleased God to send me during these last weeks, I cannot express the pleasure and comfort it has given me to receive a visit from our revered friend, Lord Halifax. He has told me of the abiding desire for reunion by which you are animated. I am made happy by that assurance, which fortifies me at this present hour.

Ut unum sint, that is the supreme desire of Christ. It is the desire of the sovereign pontiff; it is my desire; and it is also yours. May it be realized in all its fullness!

The proofs of sympathy that your grace has been good enough to have had transmitted to me have touched me deeply. I thank you for them with all my heart, and beg your grace to accept the assurances of my religious devotion.

Cardinal Mercier, Archbishop of Malines.

It is satisfying to know that, despite the deaths of the Archbishop of Malines and the Abbé Portal, the conversations of Malines are to be resumed.

I have just returned to England after a few weeks abroad and I came across a French *curé* who has quite definite ideas about the reunion problem. Monsieur Jacquot, of Audincourt, is no ordinary curé. Some four years ago he created no small stir in his parish of Audincourt and outside of it by his successful interference in a strike at the Pugeot automobile works. Abbé Jacquot wrote a little book about what he did in the strike, which was published by the *Editions Spes* and was honoured with a preface by M. Georges Goyau.

Now having settled the labour disputes in his industrial parish the good priest is desirous of rebuilding his church. He has already collected eighty thousand out of the hundred thousand francs necessary for this. But he also wishes to have an altar in his church where the Holy Sacrifice may be offered for the reunion of Christendom.

[From Rev. C. H. Palmer, London, in *The Living Church,* Milwaukee, Wis.]

Religion and World Unity

Is it possible that if we knew our business better and could see the situation aright we might be able to train this generation of children and young people so that they will overcome the

difficulties under which we have suffered and thus presently we might have a new and nobler moral order in the earth?

We are asking what part it is which religion must take in the securing of world unity. Now, if I were looking at the world not as a religious man, but as an astronomer, it would be easy for me to say that the world is a unity now. If one could imagine an astronomer standing on Mars let us say, and training his telescope upon this poor old distracted world he would say, "As far as I can see there are no backward peoples nor disturbing areas. There is no evidence that one part of the world is pulling one way and the other part pulling another. We have been watching this planet for centuries and it has always moved with perfect precision and with complete harmony in all its parts. It seems to be going exactly as it ought to go and one could not ask for a better behaved world." Happy astronomer!

If one were dealing with the world, not as the astronomer does, but with the world of men then he might wish to be a scientist rather than a religious man, for again his problem would be an easy one. It is not difficult for a mathematician for example, to demonstrate unity of mind on a world scale. He can go to any part of the world to-day with a piece of chalk, a blackboard, and a multiplication table and secure assent to practically everything he says. As soon as his terms are understood they are believed.

Take again the case of a medical man and see what a happy time he has. He may have just graduated from a university and yet with full confidence he is prepared to set up in business in any part of the world. Suppose you were to meet him and say, "Where are you going to practice?" He says, "To China," or "To Central Africa." Do you ask him, "What are your qualifications?" he will tell you and then you discover that he has never studied any human body but a Canadian body; that he knows exactly how many bones there are in that Canadian body and that the blood circulates in the same body. Well, you say to him, "How do you know that a Chinaman's blood does circulate, and what right have you to infer from your examination of a Canadian's body that the African will not have a larger number of bones in his body?" But, as a matter of fact, we find that this doctor just coming out of the university is so convinced of the unity of the whole human race that he feels certain that if he were dropped down in the middle of Africa or in the middle of China or anywhere else in the world he need not hesitate for

a second to apply what he knows, because of a difference of race or because of any other difficulties.

Again we say, "Happy doctor! Happy mathematician!" And happy it would be for the religious man if matters worked out so easily for him in dealing with exactly the same world of human beings, but all the great and difficult problems of the world come sooner or later to the door of religion, and some of them come with cynical looks in their faces and they say, "What can you do with us? Tackle us. You people that believe in almighty goodness, you people who believe in the greatness of love, look at us and see what you can do." That is how war comes to us and many other great evils which afflct the race. I believe that such things will never be solved ultimately, but by religion, and I also believe as a religious man that there is no problem in the world which cannot be solved by religion. How then can religion get to work at this business?

In the first place I think we have to agree that the Church must set its house in order. I have not lost my faith in the Church nor do I believe I ever shall. Indeed, I believe in it more than ever, but we ought to see that some things within the Church need attention if she is to make in a large way her contribution toward world unity. What about denominationalism, for example? I ask myself how can a disunited Church hope to secure a united world. There may be people on whose toes I shall tread in a minute or two, but I am very light. Some of us have ridden on a street car and it very frequently happens that people get their toes stepped on, not necessarily because one does not walk in the right way, but because there are so many toes to step on.

I believe that Christianity from the beginning was one, and this has never been lost sight of. We all believe in one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all and through and in all. But through the centuries we have thought out many inventions and have multiplied our divisions. The trouble with these divisions is that presently they get men to act as though they believed that the part is greater than the whole. This difficulty is now being recognized the world over as a live issue. It is not only here that people feel the scandal and unreasonableness of our divisions, but all over China and India as well as in all other parts of the world. Men are wondering what it is about the Christian religion, which makes us preach one Lord, one faith, one hope, one Cross, and one eternal life and then be everlastingly dividing ourselves one from the

other. Somehow or other Christian educators must so bring this question before the youth of our day and so present a way out that Christianity shall once more in the minds of our youth and through their concerted action secure the unity needed. Denominationalism must be transcended if organized Christianity is to bring the full weight of its influence to bear upon world problems.

Again, I am glad that there is so much being said about understanding. The word is a good word and there is great need of better understanding all around the world, but we should remember that many of the difficulties with which we are faced do not come from misunderstanding so much as from downright misconduct. Take the great question of slavery. I know it is out of date now, but it is more easy to talk about because it is a little removed from us. When it was here, was it due to misunderstanding? You had a body of men trying to catch other men and selling them to some others. Was any of that conduct, even the slightest fraction of it, due to misunderstanding? The slave catcher knew what he was after perfectly well, the man who bought the slave knew what he bought him for, and the slave himself understood with deadly certainty and clearness what had happened to him. It was not a misunderstanding, but a great crime.

There are many other things like that going on to-day all around the world—quite a number of sins in the world on a colossal scale carried out, moreover, under quite respectable national and imperial flags. Take an illustration from our own neighbourhood. We find that good neighbours of ours are making great effort to prohibit the use of strong drinks in their country. They have deep convictions on the question and are honest in their aims and yet you will find that there are men from friendly countries like Canada and Great Britain who are out there acting with as little conscience as controls pirates, and are doing their rascality in broad daylight and in the dark of night—trying to get into a country what millions of sincere people are anxious to get out. Is all that due to a misunderstanding?

Let us be under no delusions about the matter. A vast amount of the unrest in the world is not due so much to misunderstanding as to injustice and greed and disregard of the rights of other people, and if we are to have world unity then religious educators must so train the youth of this generation that they will feel that things which are personally bad cannot

be nationally good, and things which are nationally evil cannot be internationally good. You will have done an honest day's work in the Sunday-school and church if you can get that idea to prevail. There will be no religious education worth talking about or which will meet this difficulty of a distracted world, unless we have a new and deepened sensitiveness in this matter of right and wrong.

Again, I believe that if the Christian religion is to win great triumphs on a world scale, it will be necessary for us to be more generous and catholic than we have ever been, not merely to the folks who are near us and to the faiths that we know, but to all the peoples and religions of the earth. I would like to ask you religious educators why it has ever been thought necessary that we should deliberately set out to defend religion or defend the Bible, or to defend the Lord Jesus. We should know that they need no defense. They are our defense. There is far too much of fear in Christian hearts that the Bible and religion and the Lord Christ are not able to look after themselves. There is far too great a tendency to think that loyalty to our great faith demands that we shall take an antagonistic attitude to all other religious faiths. We believe in the ultimate triumph of Christ in the world, but how are we to conceive that triumph? Are we to think of it in terms of the Roman conqueror returning with the princes of the lands which have been subjugated chained to his chariot wheels? Is it necessary to suppose, in loyalty to our Lord, that when his triumph is completed He will have chained to his chariot wheels great religious leaders like Confucius and Buddha and others? Is this what we mean by the triumph of Christ?

Let me endeavour to give a parable of what Christianity really is capable of doing in its contacts with other faiths. I stand before a big oak tree and I have a little conversation with it. I am not much given to holding conversation with trees, but I am doing it for this occasion. I say to this broad tree, "You are really magnificent. Did you come from an acorn?" It says, "Yes, partly." "Why partly?" I say. "Oh, because part of me came from the sun, up there, 95,000,000 miles away." "Well," I say, "that is quite a respectable source to come from," and then it says, "part of me came from the clouds," and I accept that, and it says, "but part of me came from the soil." "What do you get down there?" I say. "Oh, rotten leaves and dead wood and all sorts of other dirty things," and I say, "Then you have betrayed that acorn and you have brought into your

body something that is foreign to it, and something that will defile it." "No," says the tree, "I have not betrayed the acorn. I have glorified it and expanded it and I have shown you what is its essential character, what is its inner life. You can take me from the topmost bough right down to the roots and you will not find in me anything that is not genuine oak, that is not true to the very genius of that acorn."

Now, I ask, is Christianity anything like that? Is Christianity, by virtue of its essential nature able to live in such a world as ours is, to draw life from other areas than in it, from alien faiths and ideas and customs, without defiling itself or departing from its own essential nature in a single particular? We know that it has taken queer kinds of people and transformed them, base things of the world, degraded Magdalenes and drunkards and all sorts of people like that, and has made them sit with Christ in heavenly places.

We know, moreover, that the Christian religion took over into itself at the beginning practically all the great religious and moral possessions of the Jewish people. That is why we hold the Old Testament in such reverence. Christianity took the Cross—a piece of wood which was soaked in human shame, and made of it a symbol of glory, made it into a tree of life whose leaves are for the healing of the nations. It is the glory of our Christianity that it can do things like these. We need as religious educators, to go back and hear the Master saying again, "Other sheep I have which are not of this fold, them also I must bring, and there shall be one flock and one shepherd," and as we hear the words we need not and ought not to give them any narrow interpretation. Let us hear again the old apostle saying, "Now I perceive that God is no respector of persons, but that in every nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted of Him." We must remember that Christianity is here not to destroy, but to fulfil. It is here to fill up the things which are lacking. We are not compelled in the name of Christ to summon men to surrender nor to deny the truths which exist in their faith, nor to label their faiths as false. We are here to present in a catholic and generous and human way the great and universal truths of the Christian religion.

Lastly, I believe that given a generous type of men and women and a generous interpretation of our Christian truth we have in our missionary forces the greatest single agency in the world to bring about world unity. In the first place, missionaries are the only people in the world who go and live

among the people they seek to teach and who learn their languages. The missionary identifies himself with the aspirations of the people among whom he lives. He makes their country his country, their honour his honour, and these are the only serious body of men in the world who are doing that sort of thing to-day. In some countries practically all the education that has been given up to now has been initiated and conducted by missionaries. But without attempting to indicate in any detail the types of work being carried on let this be understood, that these big-hearted men and women are striving to achieve the ends that we are here discussing, and that the overwhelming mass of them have this question very much at their hearts. They are seeking to transcend national and racial and every other type of barrier. They are looking for the day when the world shall be one great brotherhood and all of us brothers of God's own family. Already they have brought into this fellowship many hundreds of thousands and even millions of people from other lands, who have caught the same vision and who are sharing the same passion.

As a matter of fact the only important groups to be found in any of the so-called non-Christian countries who are working for world unity to-day, are those who have been brought into the fellowship of the Christian faith. They understand what we are discussing and they almost alone are able to mediate the same type of idea among their own countrymen. The Christians of India and China and Japan and Africa would be mightily strengthened in their efforts for world unity if we in these so-called Christian lands, could show greater evidence of the power of the Christian religion. They are saying, "Why is it that with all the millions of Christian men and women you have in the United States and Canada and Great Britain you cannot more definitely make your impact upon the life of the world? Why cannot you bring your power so to bear that we shall receive justice in all our national affairs? Why is it necessary for us to be forced to submit to domination from white people? Why is there so much narrow-mindedness and selfishness and small-heartedness? Why is it that so many areas of life in your great lands are in rebellion to the law of Christ? Why cannot you hold back the dogs of war and the dogs of greed?" We have no adequate answer.

I believe the greatest days of the Church are ahead of us, if we can develop among our people and especially among the youth of this generation, a greater capacity for moral indig-

nation, a greater concern for the welfare of the whole world, a greater capacity for large-hearted and catholic interpretation of our own faith, and if we are able to go out into the whole world believing all things, hoping all things and having love that never faileth.

[From an address delivered by Rev. James Endicott, D.D., at the meeting of the Religious Education Association at Toronto, Canada.]

If Leaders Were as Courageous as They Are Conservative

I believe that no adequate conference will take place "when indoctrination is the dominant motive." At the same time one cannot but recognize the difficulty of securing the type of conference for which you plead and which is necessary, moreover, if the most fruitful ends are to be achieved. On the one hand it seems necessary in a conference on such a subject, that really representative men of the various communions shall constitute the body who confer; but, because they are representative men, they are by reason of that, more likely to be sufficiently conscious in all their discussions of the views and convictions of the particular communion which they represent and, hence, the tendency will be to stress the views held by their communion and to resist every suggestion which seems to imperil them; that is, they become indoctrinators. . . . But, if on the other hand, conferences of free spirits are held, it would be quite possible to proceed on the inquiry basis; but it is not certain that the final judgments reached would all at once have much weight in the respective communions from which those men have come. If only the leaders of the respective churches were as courageous as they are conservative, and as loyal to the truth and the leadings of the Spirit of God as they are to the organizations which they represent, real and speedy advance would be possible.

[From Rev. James Endicott, Toronto, in a letter to the Secretariat of the World Conference on Faith and Order.]

BOOK REVIEWS

THE CONFUSION OF THE CHURCHES. By Rev. Kenneth D. Mackenzie, M. A., Formerly Fellow and Dean of Pembroke College, Oxford. New York: Edward S. Gorham; 286 pages.

If the writer had undertaken a review of this book when he had read two-thirds of it, he would probably have said that the author is a "doubting Thomas" in regard to present efforts looking toward the reunion of Christendom and not enthusiastic for them. The last page has been turned and this judgment remains. The author is an avowed Anglo-Catholic; and this explains his whole attitude, and suggests, in a general way, the views which we would naturally expect him to entertain with regard to the reunion of the churches and the way thereto. One or two quotations will suffice; the only remark which is necessary here being that the author thinks always of what we term "organic union." "Any form of reunion which interfered with the ultimate possibility of communion with the holy and apostolic see of Rome would leave many of us cold. So also would any scheme which would obscure the vision of unity with the great national churches of the East. So, also, reunion would be incomplete, indeed, if it did not include that vast host of Christians who are separated from historic Catholic Christianity." Reunion with the Roman Catholic Church "is the fundamental problem for an English churchman. The breach with Rome was the beginning of our isolation, and the root of our subsequent disunion. Rome stands for unity. However much her actual policy has been the cause, even the justification, of schism, it is almost impossible to conceive of any other center for a reunited Church." Speaking of the possibility of reunion with the non-episcopal churches, the author thinks that, from the Anglo-Catholic point of view, the Presbyterians are the most likely group, since among them also "the Catholic conception of Holy Orders does exist." To the Scottish Presbyterians he throws out the following suggestion: "We can only lay before our brethren in Scotland the considerations which have induced our bishops to make their large-hearted offer to the Roman Church, and ask whether they do not apply equally to the relation of the great Scottish Presbyterian Churches to the little but noble Scottish Episcopal Church, and through her to the Anglican communion and the Catholic Church." The large-hearted offer referred to is that "if Orders were the only point remaining to be settled, the Anglican bishops would be willing to submit to the repetition of the ceremony according to the Roman rite."

Enough has been said about the angle from which the question of reunion is viewed. Something should be said of the book and its contents. It is a history of the schisms with which the Church has been and is afflicted, with some account of the efforts which were made to restore unity. The story is in itself a melancholy and depressing one, but the author has not wearied of the task of following it through all of its intricate windings, and he has done it in a way that enables one to follow with a lively interest.

If one were so disposed one might produce an essay of large proportions in writing about this book. There is neither time nor space for this.

Considering the plight of the world to-day, the divided condition of the forces of Christianity, and its consequent inability to move "like a mighty army" against "the embattled foe," we will all doubtless say, with the Rev. Mr. Mackenzie, and with equal emphasis: "Something must surely be wrong somewhere." Probably it will not be disputed either, that every church which is really Christian will feel itself bound to make its most effectual contribution to the work of discovering what is wrong, and to the no less important inquiry as to the best way, if any, to correct the disease whose outward symptom is disintegration.

Any reader perusing the pages of this book, unless he be of the Anglo-Catholic mind, will many times find himself dissenting, or at least withholding assent, waiting for the evidence, sceptical if you please. And, when he analyzes his own mental attitude, he is likely to find the thing that makes him dissent or hesitate to be either an excess of emphasis or a deficiency in this respect. He will doubtless say to himself that the idea of one Church for the world under one see, wheresoever located and whosoever the occupant may be, is certainly pressed too far, if not altogether contrary to the true conception of the Church. So with the idea of apostolic succession, carrying with it authority first given by Christ to his apostles and by them handed down to their successors the bishops. So with that of the necessity of episcopacy to the unity of the Church, and that of episcopal ordination as necessary to the validity of the sacraments. On the other hand, he will probably say to himself that far too little emphasis is laid upon the unity which does exist in the real Church of Christ, which is contemplated in those names, the Body of Christ, the Temple of the Living God, the Fellowship of the Spirit. It is quite possible, no doubt, to emphasize this unity to the point where the divisions in external organization will be dismissed as negligible. But it is quite as easy to make so much of form and ceremony and tradition as to leave the impression that where these are different there can be no unity that is worth speaking of. To quote, "Unity is represented by *unquestioned* Orders."

Some things in the book will strike Americans as being amusing; as, for example, when, speaking of the extreme forms to which the sects here have developed their religions, this Englishman says, "Something in the

American climate seems to tend toward extremes." It is not surprising that this author, whose strong leaning toward Rome has been pointed out, should, in all of his references to Luther, speak with a certain antipathy—much like a Roman Catholic priest. It is fair to say that not all Anglicans are Anglo-Catholic. The book is well worth reading, but it should be read with discrimination.—*M. G. G. Scherer.*

THE ONE BODY AND THE ONE SPIRIT: A Study in the Unity of the Church. By T. A. Lacey, M. A., F. S. A., Canon of Worcester. New York: George H. Doran Company; price $2.00.

For those who have read recent books of English scholarship on the ministry and organization of the early Church, Canon Lacey covers familiar ground, but he gives a careful and scholarly summary of the known facts. He points out that, if a particular church decide to have no more bishops, it does not cease to be a part of the universal Church. Baptized believers in that community do not cease to be members of Christ's Body, and their deprivation of a chief pastor may be compared with the death of a bishop in a diocese. Those who consider the episcopate necessary do not treat dioceses as defunct when their bishops die. The interval without a bishop in one case may be short, in the other indefinitely long, but he believes the principle the same. The Body of Christ, he says, must be articulated with diversity of function.

Canon Lacey strives to find a basis for unity. Intercommunion alone, he thinks, will give completeness to the Body of Christ. He shows historically that restoration of Communion did not always come on the lines mapped out by what men thought theological necessity. He says candid words on St. Paul's authorization to be an apostle. St. Paul did not submit to ordination at the hands of the Twelve, yet they endorsed his apostleship. St. Augustine and other great leaders were liberal in the restoration of heretics and schismatics. "The wind of the Spirit," writes Mr. Lacey, "blew where it listed, not where men had laid out its course. So it will probably be in the future."

Not the least valuable part of the book is the Appendix, consisting of two articles, one by Canon Lacey, and one by the eminent Free Churchman, Dr. Vernon Bartlet, on "Minimum Conditions of Inter-communion." The spirit of both pronouncements is wholly fine, and they have many passages of hearty agreement. The rock on which the difficulties strike is the nature of bishops. Both Canon Lacey and Dr. Bartlet agree on the validity of lay baptism. Canon Lacey thinks that there is not sufficient evidence in the New Testament to say that the Holy Communion was ever administered

by laymen; and, in any case, the rule soon came that a valid Communion must be administered by a bishop or a presbyter appointed by him. Dr. Bartlet feels sure that laymen did administer the Lord's Supper, but grants the subsequent custom of a bishop's responsibility for the due administration of the sacrament. Only Dr. Bartlet questions Canon Lacey's definition of the early bishop. He believes that even the bishop of St. Ignatius's famous sentences was no more and no less than the Congregational pastor as we know him to-day. "Nevertheless," adds Dr. Bartlet, "in order that 'all the members' of Christ should be able outwardly, as well as inwardly, 'to participate without hindrance and without hesitation' in the one Lord's Table, the non-episcopal groups might consent, as an act of loving deference for the traditional Catholic conscience in their brethren, to mutual recommissioning *relative to a greater approximation to a truly Catholic Church*, if only it were really mutual in the deference shown to conscience on both sides." —*Dr. Charles L. Slattery.*

THE CHURCH OF THE SPIRIT. A Brief Survey of the Spiritual Tradition in Christianity, by Francis Greenwood Peabody. New York: The Macmillan Co.; price $2.00.

The first chapter, which contains the real heart of the book, deals largely with the contrast between "the church of authority and the church of the Spirit." "The most definite, and perhaps the only distinct line of cleavage (between Christians), runs between those who are primarily concerned with Christianity as an institution and those who find its essential character in an experience; between dogmatic Christianity and spiritual Christianity; between the church of authority and what may loosely be defined as the church of the Spirit" (p. 13). The latter is (p. 27) " 'the blessed company of all faithful people.' " It is (p. 28) the "compulsive fellowship of religious experience." It is to be found within the existing churches, yet overleaping their bounds. It is a wider grouping that embraces all who, whether within or without a church, are loyal to the "convincing Master," Jesus.

Now, this does not seem to be very clear. One understands the contrast between the temper that stresses dogma and institution and authority, and the temper that exalts individual freedom and experience; between the authoritarian attitude and the liberal. But just why the latter should be termed "spiritual" in contrast with the former, is not plain. . . . Why not set over against "authority" some such term as "experience" or "freedom".

Again, what is the "church of authority"? Does it lie outside "the blessed company of all faithful people"? The author would surely say: "No." It seems in his mind to comprise the majority of the existing churches and, therefore, to dominate them, so that roughly these organi-

zations might almost be identified with it. An exception would be made of the Unitarians and Friends and any other professedly liberal communion. In reality, he does not seem to be speaking of a church at all, but of a temper, "habit of mind," "disposition," running through the existing churches; and so it is with his "church of the Spirit." The use of the term "church" is, therefore, confusing. Doubtless something is to be gained by its employment. It may be inspiring to look upon those who share one's own temper as comprising a church in which one may seek companionship and the embodiment of all one's ideal of what a church should be. But unless these like-minded people actually form themselves into a visible organization—and Dr. Peabody is rightly opposed to such a step—one after all has not a church, but a vague fellowship. Moreover, to call this a church is apt to rouse separatist feeling. "I am of the church of the Spirit, they of the church of authority." How much good will such a thought do to him who entertains it? In spite of the author's generosity one feels a subtle air of divisiveness breathing through this very book.

Dr. Peabody does not, as has been said, wish to see liberals form a separate church. While "that would be a dramatic, and in many aspects, a fortunate consummation," yet "such an organized movement would have to contend against all the forces of deeply rooted sentiment and inherited affection; it would require a new Chalmers, not to say a new Luther; and an inflamed sense of oppression which the increasing tolerance of many communions tends to extinguish; and it might easily result . . . . in a new church of authority, free from external control, yet by no means free from internal politics, and compulsions" (p. 42). Instead, he would have them remain within their present churches and foster the unity of the Spirit already existing with those outside. "They have discovered the comprehensive affinities of religious experience and, while they may tolerate divided organizations as providing for diversity of temperament of habit of mind, they leave the boundaries of such organizations as unbounded as the three thousand miles of frontier separating Canada from the United States" (p. 43).

Chapter III deals with the sins to which the church of the Spirit is peculiarly liable. These he believes to be four: *spiritual illiteracy*, or "the lack of susceptibility to spiritual influences and insight for spiritual realities," so that "one believes oneself scientific when one is only insensitive"; *spiritual complacency*, for "Dean Inge is probably justified in remarking that he regards 'the defective sense of sin as the chief flaw of liberal Christians' "; *spiritual indolence*, a tranquil assurance leading one to forget that, after all, the Cross means "heroism"; and *spiritual intolerance*, since "intolerant mysticism may be as presumptuous as intolerant Pharisaism."

In his fourth chapter on the church of the Spirit militant, Dr. Peabody carries through a series of contrasts between the aim of the church of

authority and that of the church of the Spirit. . . . . The social service of the church of the Spirit is primarily reconstructive; it does not pity people but believes in them, co-operates with them, serves *them*, not itself. In the modern industrial world the church of authority wants to dominate industrial relations, a desire which "not infrequently leads it to invade economic life with ill-considered or precipitate militancy." "The militancy of the church of the Spirit," on the other hand, "is primarily concerned, not with the economics of industry, but with its ethics." "The Kingdom of God, in the business world as elsewhere, is not an external growth, but a spiritual revolution, to be created, not by better machinery, but by better men" (p. 150). Yet apparently Dr. Peabody is not opposed to machinery. "Each undertaking of fraternalism and co-operation in industry; each provision for training in efficiency and responsibility; each form of mutual service and loyalty in business, which converts economic science into moral science, is not only a contribution to industrial peace but is a witness to the vitality of the church of the Spirit."

The charge that he makes against the church of authority in its dealings with the industrial world is strange indeed. Are religious authoritarians really proposing campaigns of "Christian economics" and of "Christian sociology" with a view to dominate industry? And how is every endeavour, after a more ethical way of conducting business, a "witness to the vitality of the church of the Spirit"? Are all who make such attempts theological liberals? May some not be authoritarians in religion, or even agnostics?

The fifth chapter on the church of the Spirit triumphant tells of the allies which are even now helping in the victorious carrying out of its programme. First, of course, it must depend upon "the genuineness and vitality of its own religious life." But there co-operate with it *science*, whose best exponents are in sympathy with the aims of liberal Christianity; *literature*, whose "modern masters" are turning specially to mysticism; *poetry*, generally "detached from the church of authority" and now furnishing "powerful allies to religion"; and finally, the *church of authority itself*, "the most essential and, indeed, indispensable ally, by whose tardy enlistment the triumph of the church of the Spirit is still delayed." . . . . He, like the authoritarian, wants his own to "become the dominating habit of mind in accredited teaching." He confronts the church of authority with "the audacious assertion that in its formal procedure it has been tempted to take the wrong road; making central what was incidental, setting logic before life, speculation before inspiration, the letter before the spirit." He does not say to the authoritarian: "You perceive, doubtless, a side of the truth that I miss. Let us each contribute his peculiar treasure to the Church of the future." He says instead: "Become spiritualized (meaning, become liberalized), both in conduct and in creed."

A minor interest of the book lies in its personal note. It is to the author a kind of *apologia pro vita sua* (p. 8). But it is chiefly significant as proceeding from a recognized spokesman of Protestant Modernism, and as "approaching, at some points, an exposition of the principles generally known as those of liberal Christianity" (p. 8). One could wish that it were less confused in its thinking, that it did more justice to the authoritarian temper and claimed less for the liberal attitude; for it breathes a frank and noble spirit and utters a real message.—*Prof. Fleming James.*

ANGLICANISM, AN INTRODUCTION TO ITS HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY. By W. H. Carnegie, Sub-Dean of Westminster Abbey. New York: G. B. Putnam's Sons; price $2.00.

This book combines scholarly insight, breadth of outlook, calm judgment, and finality to a very rare degree. The author shows that "institutional continuity on its outer side, intense traditionalism on its inner—these are the master features of English life in all its chief aspects and activities." "The Anglican Church has maintained its institutional continuity by virtue of its strong traditionalism, by virtue of the instinctive reverence with which its members have all along been disposed to regard the teachings of past experience." Accordingly, Anglicanism has run true to itself from the days of the organization of the English Church in the seventh century—this in spite of the readiness of Anglicans to be influenced by one movement after another. Owing to the power of traditionalism, each succeeding convulsion has left Anglicanism, "modified it may be in form, and enriched in content, but unaltered in essential character and direction." He illustrates this in successive chapters by describing the principal factors in history, which have given colour to Anglicanism without changing its essential nature.

He says "that the great majority of instructed and intelligent churchmen of the present day, whatever their professed affinities or antagonisms, start from Tractarian assumptions, and accept Tractarian ideals, and approach the consideration of the religious problem from the Tractarian standpoint."

In other words: "In practice, if not in theory, the great majority of earnest churchmen nowadays are sacramentalists, and their sacramentalism is one of the signs and outcomes of their traditional consciousness, reawakened by Tractarianism." Again, "The prevalent conception of the Christian life is that of a continuous growth, mediated and maintained by inter-connected sacramental ordinances." In spite of their differing explanations, Evangelicals and Catholics agree in this, that "the ordinances themselves they set great store by, and use them as the main medium and implement of their pastoral activities."—*Dr. Francis J. Hall.*

A Statement Covering Ordination to the Ministry, Issued by the United Church of Canada, 250 pages.

This is an important and comprehensive volume. It is a permanent part of the literature relating to the most constructive work in church reunion which has been accomplished since the Reformation. It contains a full statement, covering 250 pages, of the history, the tenets, the polity, and doctrines of the Presbyterian, the Methodist, and the Congregational churches in Canada which now form the United Church of Canada.

Section one, traversing sixty-three pages, describes the history and the polity and doctrines of the Presbyterian Church. The process is traced whereby the four churches of Presbyterian connection in Canada were united in one Presbyterian body. There is a careful statement showing its continuity with the parent Church of Scotland. And the authorities on Presbyterian doctrine and polity are freely and fully quoted to set forth the conception of the church, its ministry and its ordinances according to the standards of the Presbyterian Church.

According to these standards, the church is conceived as of Divine origin, to be distinguished from every other form of human society; it is composed of all believers who are united in faith with our Lord Jesus Christ; and its ministry is authenticated by the unbroken continuity of its presbyters from apostolic times. The vexed question of the priority of bishops over presbyters is discussed from every angle, and the Presbyterian position is based on the statement of St. Jerome (p. 36) "that a bishop and a priest is all one."

The Methodist statement covers one hundred and thirty-two pages. It traces the history of Methodism in England, in the United States, and in Canada, and the relation of all three with the Church of England. It is shown that in its conception of the church, the Methodist Church has been in substantial agreement with the Catholic conception of the Church of England. The story of the ordination of Methodist ministers in America is told in full, and the validity of Methodist ordination through its bishops is vindicated by copious quotation from Methodist authorities. This defence of the regularity of its ministry differs only slightly from that of the Presbyterian statement, because of the closer connection of Methodism in its origins with the Church of England and its bishopric. There is appended the full ritual of the Methodist Church for the ordination of its ministers, and much other valuable material relating to the doctrinal basis of the church.

The Congregational statement is briefer, comprising fifty-five pages. The history of Congregationalism is told from the beginning of Independence, and its relation not only to the Church of England, but to the other dissenting bodies is described in accurate detail. It is made clear that the polity and doctrines of the Congregational Church have been essentially

the same in England, in the United States, and in Canada. And, whereas the conception of church and ministry is somewhat less "High" than in the Presbyterian and Methodist churches, in essence they do not differ from them.

All of this makes clear how it was possible for these three great communions to come into agreement and ultimate union. And the great value of this entire statement lies in the fact that it forms a possible basis of union of such churches anywhere.

It should be added, however, that nowhere in this entire discussion is any possible basis of agreement on the subject of ordination between Anglican and non-Anglican churches suggested: an agreement which must ultimately be found if the unity of the English-speaking churches is ever to be accomplished.—*Raymond Calkins.*

SHALL WE HAVE A CREED? E. Hershey Sneath, Ph.D., LL.D. New York: The Century Co.; 69 pages.

This little book embodies the substance of an address which the author delivered, as president of the Theological Society before that organization, and which was repeated before the convocation of the Divinity School of Yale University in 1925. It was published in response to many requests for the message in book form.

"There is really no more vital question and no more sacred and imperative obligation confronting the Church to-day than that of determining the real value of the reorganized religious values, and, by a comparative study of them, ascertaining what is the supreme essential of our religion."

The answer to the question: Shall we have a creed? is to ascertain the supreme essential of the Christian religion and embody this and this only in a creed.

What did Jesus Himself answer when He was asked by the tempting lawyer what he had to do to inherit eternal life? Jesus asked him: "What is written in the law?" The lawyer answered: "Thou shalt love the Lord they God with all they heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbour as thyself." And Jesus said unto him: "Thou hast answered right; this do and thou shalt live."

Here is the law of righteousness, the law of eternal life, the law of salvation. Let us, therefore, make it the central article of our creed. Here is no system of religious metaphysics, no series of theological dogmas, as a condition of inheriting eternal life. We are not told what to *believe* but what to *do* in order to be saved. Its emphasis is not on intellectual values but on moral values as the supreme values.

Let us, therefore, take this approved formula of righteousness, concludes Dr. Sneath, and make it the central article of our creed, of a creed for a reunited Church.

To this central article, let us add only two others, which are seen to be implied in it, "when we study it in connection with the conversation of Jesus in which it was uttered." The complete creed would then be as follows: (1) I believe in Jesus' conception of God as the righteous Father who desires and labours for the righteousness of his children. (2) I believe in Jesus' conception of the law of love, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbour as thyself," as the supreme and all-comprehensive law of righteousness. (3) I believe in Jesus' conception of the immortality of the righteous soul.

It is especially startling to note that, in spite of this, Dr. Sneath would take as the central tenet of his creed a passage of Scripture taken from a book of the Old Testament devoted to the establishment of *belief*. The "how" of Dr. Sneath, or "law of love," as he calls it, he quotes from Luke 10:25. It is also in Matthew 22:35 and in Mark 12:29. In the latter it is uttered by Jesus Himself, who gives the full quotation of Deuteronomy 6:4, 5, from which it is taken: "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord. Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart and with thy whole soul and with thy whole strength."

Deuteronomy is not talking about "the law of love." It is talking about the love of the Law, and so was Jesus in the Gospel passages quoted. It has to do with the authoritative revelation to man by God Himself of the oneness of God and of his will: *the Law*. It is putting an end to "private judgment" about which is right or wrong: polytheism or monotheism, immanence or personality of God. It is putting an end to the so-called "sacred rights of the spirit of man" to believe or not to believe that the Lord our God is one Lord, to act or not to act according to the commandments, and so to love or not to love Him, do or not do his will. Man *must* believe the one God and love Him. Thus only can He have righteousness: through belief and through love founded on belief. So that "the great commandment," far from being antithetical to belief, is but the summing up of an attitude of will based on belief. "Thou shalt love the Lord with thy whole heart," that is, Thou shalt keep his commandments and thus gain righteousness, *because* now thou knowest and thou believest, "O Israel, that the Lord our God is one Lord," and thou knowest his commandments. The intellectual value precedes and conditions the moral.

If Dr. Sneath, therefore, insists, as he does, on taking away the intellectual values from the creed, he can only use "the great commandment" in his creed by stripping it of its fundamental Christian meaning. For, as they stand, the words of the great commandment imply the end of the

private judgment of man as to right and wrong, as to the reality of the supernatural, monotheism, the actual communication of a personal God at given moments of history; hence the possibility of such communications, hence the reality of the duality of spirit and matter and the possible action of the spirit in the material world.

Other implications press for recognition. "I believe in Jesus' conception of the law of love." We saw that this means: I believe in Jesus' conception that to love God is the essence of the Mosaic law. Well, what was Jesus' conception of this law, since you believe in it? What was his conception, for instance, of his own relation to it? What *was* Jesus' conception of "the law" and of its interpretation, in the new dispensation, of his own relation to it, of the difficulty man had in living up to it, and of the means at his disposition to do so? What about the perfection or imperfection of man's nature, the need or lack of need, the means or lack of means of help from God, and Jesus' own relation thereto? Can you believe in Jesus' *conception* of the law, and shut out the implication?

Then take articles 1 and 3: "I believe in Jesus' conception of God as the righteous Father who desires and labours for the righteousness of his children." What *was* this conception? Can you speak of it without implying Jesus' conception of his own relations to God? "The righteousness of his children!" Why aren't they righteous to start with? Why should God have to "labour" for it. And how does He "labour"? Was not that question at the origin of Protestantism? What *was* Jesus' conception of his relation to all these questions? "I believe in Jesus' conception of the immortality of the righteous soul." What is the "righteous soul"? We are back to article 2. But why not Jesus' conception of the fate of the "unrighteous soul"? Did He not have one? Why believe in one more than in the other? Are they not complementary?

So it is hard to see that even Dr. Sneath's creed can dodge the question of "sin," "free-will," "grace," "merit," "faith," "works," "hell," "heaven," Jesus' "divinity," "atonement," unless the words of its three articles are divested of all meaning.

Dr. Sneath's appeal should encourage all who are interested in the reunion of the churches to renewed efforts. There is no doubt that "the great commandment" He selected as the basis of his creed is the essence of morality, but morality is based on *law*, on allegiance to law, on *belief* in the authority of the law-maker.

"Love thy country" sums up all the laws of the land and insures good citizenship, but there would be no country to love and no citizenship if there were no laws or no belief in sovereignty. "Love thy God" sums up "the law" and insures righteousness, but there would be no known God to love and no certain righteousness if there were no revelation or belief in a revelation. If to-day *belief* is lost in the sovereignty of the law-makers

or in the laws, to-morrow there will be no love of country, but only anarchy. If to-day *belief* in the Lord and his revelation, with all its implications, is swept away from the minds of men, to-morrow there will be no love of God or of his laws, no religion in their hearts, no certain righteousness; at best, there will only be again, as of old, in parts unreached by the revelation of what to believe, an altar to the unknown God.—*Contributed.*

FOUNDATIONS OF FAITH. III Ecclesiological. By W. E. Orchard, D.D. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd.

This book is made up of chapters each of which was published as a monthly tract, and thus constitutes a third volume in a series on the Foundations of Faith, No. 1 Theological and No. 2 Christological, having been previously issued. Dr. Orchard, minister of the Kings Weigh House Church, London, is a Presbyterian by ordination, a Congregationalist by profession, and a Catholic by approximation. Anyone who has had the privilege of attending Dr. Orchard's church, and of hearing one of his strong evangelical and deeply spiritual messages, will recall the incongruous setting of vestments, elaborate ritual, and what not in which the dissenting minister and his Protestant sermon were lodged. He would be prepared, however, for the kind of book Dr. Orchard has published as his Ecclesiology. The Foreword advises us that the publication of two of the chapters as tracts, one on the Catholic Church, and the other on the Eucharist, has awakened a controversy which does not augur too well for the reception of the book as a whole, by which we may infer that the author has little hope of satisfying a large number of church leaders in different communions. The Catholic will not assent to such an interpretation of the Holy Spirit's work as will recognize the apostolicity or value of spiritual movements outside the Church of Rome; nor will he concede a valid church unity which does not bring every professed believer into complete subjection to papal authority; while the Protestant, on the other hand, will be slow to identify apostolicity, holiness, and essential unity with the pretensions of the Roman see. Dr. Orchard rejects the symbolic and spiritual interpretation put upon Christ's words in the institution of the Holy Supper, and contends that transubstantiation and the sacrifice of the mass best connote the meaning and the blessing of the Eucharist. To support his view, however, and commend the Catholic view of the sacrament to the Protestant mind, he has to adopt the kind of symbolizing and spiritualizing which as interpreting our Lord's words he rejects. Nevertheless, Dr. Orchard faces one problem after another relating to the church, more particularly that of the unity of the church, in an earnest, confident, broadminded way, and his plea for Roman Catholicism, of a refined and idealized sort, will stimulate earnest thought and the very controversy he himself has anticipated.—*J. R. S.*

Organizations for the Promotion of Christian Unity

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF CHRISTIAN UNITY, Inc. Having its inception in the Work of Thomas Campbell, a Presbyterian Minister of Washington, Pa., 1809; present organization, 1910. President, Levi G. Batman, Youngstown, Ohio; Secretary, Rev. H. C. Armstrong, 504 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore, Md., U. S. A. For intercessory prayer, friendly conferences, and distribution of irenic literature—"till we all attain unto the unity of the faith." Pentecost Sunday is the day named for special prayers for, and sermons on, Christian Unity in all Churches.

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF THE UNITY OF CHRISTENDOM, 1857. President, Athelstan Riley, Esq., 2 Kensington Court, London; Secretary in the United States, Rev. Calbraith Bourn Perry, Cambridge, N. Y. For intercessory prayer for the reunion of the Roman Catholic, Greek, and Anglican Communions.

CHRISTIAN UNITY ASSOCIATION OF SCOTLAND, 1903, Secretary, Rev. Robert W. Weir, Edinburgh. For maintaining, fostering, and expressing the consciousness of the underlying unity that is shared by many members of the different Churches in Scotland.

CHRISTIAN UNITY FOUNDATION, 1910. President, Rev. Nehemiah Boynton; Secretary, Rev. Linley V. Gordon, 70 Fifth Ave., New York City. For the promotion of Christian Unity throughout the world by research and conference.

CHURCHMAN'S UNION, 1898. President, Prof. Percy Gardner; Secretary, Rev. John H. Bentley, Souldern Rectory, Banbury, England. For cultivation of friendly relations between the Church of England and all other Christian Communions.

CONTINUATION COMMITTEE OF THE WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER, 1910. Chairman, Rt. Rev. Charles H. Brent; Secretariat, P. O. Box 226, Boston, Mass, U. S. A. For a world conference of all Christians relative to the unity of Christendom.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON ORGANIC UNION, 1918. Ad Interim Committee— Chairman, Rev. Joseph A. Vance, Detroit, Mich.; Secretary, Rev. Rufus W. Miller, Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia. For the organic union of the Evangelical Churches in the United States of America.

FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA, 1908. President, Dr. Robert E. Speer; Secretary, Rev. Charles S. Macfarland, 105 E. 22d St., New York. For the co-operation of the various Protestant Communions in service, rather than an attempt to unite upon definitions of theology and polity.

FREE CHURCH FELLOWSHIP, 1911. Rev. Malcolm Spencer, Bryn Melyn, Harrow Weald, Middlesex. For the cultivation of corporate prayer and thought for a new spiritual fellowship and communion with all branches of the Christian Church.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE EVANGELICAL FREE CRURCHES OF ENGLAND, 1895. President, Rev. H. Elvet Lewis, M. A., 37 Highbury, New Park, N. 5, London. Secretary, Rev. Thomas Nightingale, Memorial Hall, Farringdon Street, E. C. 4, London. For facilitating fraternal intercourse and co-operation among the Evangelical Free Churches in England.

UNIVERSAL CHRISTIAN CONFERENCE ON LIFE AND WORK, 1920. Chairmen, Archbishop of Upsala, Archbishop of Canterbury, Patriarch of Constantinople, and Rev. A. J Brown; Secretary, Rev. Henry A. Atkinson, 70 Fifth Ave., New York City. For union of the Churches in common, practical work, and to insist that the principles of the Gospel be applied to the solution of contemporary social and international problems.

WORLD ALLIANCE FOR PROMOTING INTERNATIONAL FRIENDSHIP THROUGH THE CHURCHES, 1914. Chairman, Most Rev. Randall Thomas Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury; Hon. Secretary, Rt. Hon. Sir Willoughby H. Dickinson, 41 Parliament St., London, S. W. 1; Chairman, American Council, Rev. William P. Merrill; General Secretary Rev. Henry A. Atkinson, 70 Fifth Ave., New York City. For joint endeavour to achieve the promotion of international friendship through the Churches and the avoidance of war.

WORLD'S EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE, 1846; Incorporated 1912. Chairman, Sir Andrew Wingate; General Secretary, Henry Martyn Gooch, 19 Russell Sqr., London, W. C. 1. To enable Christians of British and foreign nations to realize in themselves, and to manifest to others, that living and essential union which binds together all believers in the fellowship of Christ. Universal Week of prayer organized by the Alliance since 1846.

PRINTED IN UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY THE
HESS PRINTING COMPANY
BALTIMORE, MD.

OL. XVI. No. 3 JANUARY, 1927

"God gave unto us the Ministry of Reconciliation"

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

INTERDENOMINATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL

CONTENTS

The Editor's Notes:
The Barriers to Unity and Their Removal—Barriers Named and Their Remedies—The Summary

The Call to Christian Union . . . . . RALPH V. HINKLE

Is Church Union Attainable? . . . . . GEORGE W. RICHARDS

Church Union and the Question of Creed in Australia . . . . . ANDREW R. OSBORN

"Una Sancta" . . . . . J. G. TASKER

Requirements for Reunion . . . . . FRANCIS J. HALL

The Church's New Major Interest . . CHARLES LLOYD GARRISON

What People and Papers Are Saying About Unity
Cross Currents in the Tide of Christian Unity—Some Conditions of Reunion—The Church the Mother of Us All—The Reunion Impasse

Book Reviews
Cardinal Mercier—Recollections and Reflections—Preaching in Theory and Practice—Sectarian Shackles—The Group Spirit in Church Life—The Development of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit—The Soul of Religion and Other Addresses

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY, Inc.
504 N. FULTON AVE., BALTIMORE, MD., U. S. A.
AGENTS:
Fleming H. Revell Company, New York
Maruzen Company, Ltd., Tokyo, Osaka, Kyoto, Fukuoka and Sendai

CONTENTS

JANUARY, 1927

VOL. XVI No. 3.

THE EDITOR'S NOTES 229

THE CALL TO CHRISTIAN UNION. RALPH V. HINKLE 245

IS CHURCH UNION ATTAINABLE? ..... GEORGE W. RICHARDS 253

CHURCH UNION AND THE QUESTION OF CREED IN AUSTRALIA ... ANDREW R. OSBORN 268

"UNA SANCTA" ..... J. G. TASKER 277

REQUIREMENTS FOR REUNION.. FRANCIS J. HALL 281

THE CHURCH'S NEW MAJOR INTEREST ..... CHARLES LLOYD GARRISON 297

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING 313

BOOK REVIEWS 331

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

504 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore, Md., U. S. A.

CONTRIBUTED ARTICLES:—THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY is open to contributions from all Christians—Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Protestant, and all other Christians who accept Jesus as Lord and Saviour. It is entirely immaterial whether these contributions agree or disagree with the Editor's position, or the position of any contributor. We are seeking to bring together those who differ, for unless we frankly face our differences, and think them through, we shall never agree. THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY welcomes to its Forum all Ministers of Reconciliation.

PRICE:—The price of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY, published in January, April, July, and October, is seventy-five cents a single copy, or two dollars and fifty cents a year, in the United States and all parts of the world. A local church of any communion contributing annually $5.00 or more to THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY EXTENSION FUND will be entitled to receive two copies of THE QUARTERLY free for one year—one copy going to the minister and the other copy to some designated person or institution.

Entered as second-class matter October 18th, 1923, at the Post Office at Baltimore, Md., U.S.A., under the Act of Congress of March 3rd, 1879.

A Statement

THIS journal is the organ of no party other than those, growing up in all parties, who are interested in the Unity of the Church of Christ. Its pages are free to all indications of Christian Unity and Ventures of Faith. It maintains that, whether so accepted or not, all Christians—Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Protestant, and all others who accept Jesus as Lord and Saviour—are parts of the Church of Christ and that their Equality before God is the paramount issue of modern times.

Such a journal must, necessarily, be unofficial in its attempt to be an Interpreter of the mind of the churches and in furnishing a Forum for better understanding and cordial appreciation between the divided, and sometimes far isolated, communions of Christendom. It, thereby, seeks to contribute something to clear the way to the Altar of Reconciliation.

It does not hold itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors, except in a very general way as to their character and general attitude; but it invites to its pages such contributions of thought as will, on one hand, help in the removal of misunderstandings, and, on the other, create an atmosphere where our differences may be frankly faced and freely discussed in Christian Fellowship.

All contributors are allowed the same freedom in the expression of their thoughts, as the Editor exercises for himself. He does not anticipate that others will always approve his thoughts, any more than he presumes to assume responsibility for the thoughts of others; but every writer is responsible for what appears above his own name. We are to be free to think and equally free to let think, until, in corporate thinking and corporate praying, we find the Road to Brotherhood.

Consequently, this journal is not only not the organ of any party in Christendom; but, likewise, it is not the exponent of any theory of Christian Unity. It follows the reality in personal experience of spiritual growth in Christ—growing up in Him and toward other Christians as we find the Truth, which shall free us from suspicion, prejudice, pride, and unlove. Then we shall be able to interpret Christ in those terms which He expressed in his own words,—"By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have Love one to another."

The Christian Union Quarterly

Edited by Peter Ainslie, D. D.

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

Dr. Hamilcar Alivisatos,
Athens, Greece.

Bishop Charles P. Anderson,
Chicago, Ill.

Rev. Nehemiah Boynton, D.D.,
New York, N. Y.

Bishop Charles H. Brent,
Buffalo, N. Y.

Dean Charles R. Brown,
New Haven, Conn.

Prof. William Adams Brown,
New York, N. Y.

Rev. Raymond Calkins, D.D.,
Cambridge, Mass.

Bishop James Cannon, Jr.,
Washington, D. C.

Prof. Dr. J. Eugene Choisy,
Geneva, Switzerland.

Rev. S. D. Chown, D.D.,
Toronto, Canada.

Dr. Francis E. Clark,
Boston, Mass.

Dr. J. A. Cramer,
Utrecht, Holland.

Prof. Dr. Adolf Deissmann,
Berlin, Germany.

Rev. A. W. Fortune, D.D.,
Lexington, Kentucky

Dean H. E. W. Fosbroke,
New York, N. Y.

Dean W. E. Garrison,
Chicago, Ill.

Principal Alfred E. Garvie,
London, England.

Most Rev. Metropolitan Germanos,
Thyatira, Asia Minor.

President W. A. Harper,
Elon College, N. C.

Dr. Henry T. Hodgkin,
Shanghai, China.

Rev. Finis S. Idleman, D.D.,
New York, N. Y.

Dean W. R. Inge,
London, England.

Prof. Rufus M. Jones,
Haverford, Pa.

Bishop Edwin S. Lines,
Newark, N. J.

Dr. Frederick Lynch,
New York, N. Y.

Very Rev. J. A. M'Clymont, D.D.,
Edinburgh, Scotland.

Prof. Samuel McComb,
Cambridge, Mass.

Bishop Francis J. McConnell,
Pittsburgh, Pa.

Bishop William F. McDowell,
Washington, D. C.

The Bishop of Manchester,
Manchester, England.

Rev. William P. Merrill, D.D.,
New York, N. Y.

Dr. Wilfred Monod,
Paris, France.

Dr. C. C. Morrison,
Chicago, Ill.

Dr. John R. Mott,
New York, N. Y.

Bishop Harald Ostenfeld,
Copenhagen, Denmark.

Bishop Edward L. Parsons,
San Francisco, Calif.

Prof. Arthur S. Peake,
Manchester, England.

President George W. Richards,
Lancaster, Pa.

Principal W. B. Selbie,
Oxford, England.

Rev. J. H. Shakespeare, D.D.,
London, England.

Pastor Dr. Friedrich Siegmund-Schultze,
Berlin, Germany.

Dr. Robert E. Speer,
New York, N. Y.

The Archbishop of Upsala,
Upsala, Sweden.

Dr. Henry van Dyke,
Princeton, N. J.

Rev. Joseph A. Vance, D.D.,
Detroit, Mich.

Bishop Boyd Vincent,
Cincinnati, Ohio.

Bishop Luther B. Wilson,
New York, N. Y.

Unity of Spirit

THE FIRST THING NEEDED IS TO SHOW THE WORLD THAT CHRISTIANS HAVE A REAL UNITY OF SPIRIT. ONE CANNOT VISUALIZE CHRIST ADVISING HIS FOLLOWERS TO WITHDRAW FROM COMMUNION OR CO-OPERATION WITH THEIR FELLOWS BECAUSE THEY COULD NOT AGREE ON THEIR EXPLANATION OF HIM. IT IS POSSIBLE TO FAIL IN THEOLOGICAL AGREEMENT AND YET REPRODUCE CHRIST'S SPIRIT. IT HAS BEEN DONE. BUT THEOLOGICAL AGREEMENT, EVEN IF POSSIBLE, WOULD, WITHOUT HIS SPIRIT, BE FUTILE. ECCLESIASTICAL AND THEOLOGICAL UNITY MAY FOR THE NONCE BE IMPOSSIBLE. BUT CHRISTIANS OUGHT TO BE ABLE TO PROVE OPENLY AND CONCRETELY THEIR UNITY OF SPIRIT. THE NON-CHRISTIAN WORLD IS SAYING NOT SO MUCH, "TEACH US" AS "SHOW US." THIS UNITY OF SPIRIT IS ONE THING THEY WANT TO SEE.

F. W. RAWLINSON,
Shanghai, China.

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

JANUARY, 1927

THE EDITOR'S NOTES

The Barriers to Unity and Their Removal

It is a slowly growing conviction among many in all communions that a divided Church can neither express the mind of Christ nor function properly for the triumph of that mind throughout the world. The whole issue is gradually being lifted out of its old and traditional setting where one communion thought itself superior to all other communions and to whom all other communions would have to come for a basis of Christian unity, into a new angle of approach, whereby all communions can bring the offerings of their thought and devotion to a common altar in the open and observed by all, where equality and fraternity and devotion can find free expression about the person of Jesus Christ.

It is becoming more and more evident that denominationalism is a denial of that for which Christ stands. All sorts of apologies have been made in the past and church historians have roamed pretty far afield to find explanations for denominationalism, especially for some one or other denomination. But now we are passing out of that period. It is interesting how some denominations do not like to be called denominations. In doing this they may claim superiority by assuming that they are *the* Church, as in the instance of the Roman Catholics, or that they are merely a movement in the Church, as is claimed by the Disciples. This all indicates that there is a positive witness against denominationalism, although the objection to being called a denomination, whether coming from Roman Catholics, Eastern Orthodox, Episcopalians (including Anglicans), and Disciples, is of little consequence. In the instances cited it is a juggling of words and amounts to nothing. The fact of a divided Church is here and that communion that can

show the greatest penitence because of a divided Christendom is the one that will help most to the solution.

It is not going to be found by boasting of this or that or the other. That method is neither spiritual nor scientific. Some communion has got to be "gentle and humble in heart" like Jesus. But perhaps that is too much to expect of any type of organized Christianity. It does not go in that direction. Then there must be individual Christians from various communions who are unafraid to be gentle and humble.

Christian unity is not a Utopian thing. It is as practical as the American Colonies' becoming the United States of America, or the Pennsylvania railroad's building a tunnel under the Hudson river. Because it is a new field the Christian need not be any more afraid of it than is the scientist who explores a new field in the physical world. It is a thrilling adventure. Some things that are precious to some will be overturned to make way for other things that are precious to all. It is not, What are we going to give up? That is no question for seekers of truth to ask. But, instead, What have we to give for the good of all?

The barriers must go down. We cannot think of Christ in any other terms than that it is his will that they go down. I have asked a number of distinguished men of various communions for a brief expression of their views on this subject and they are of one mind that there are barriers,—great and difficult barriers,—but they must go down.

Barriers Named and Their Remedies

Dr. John R. Mott, International Missionary Council, New York, says:—

In my judgment by far the greatest obstacle to genuine Christian unity is the lack of will to such unity. When Christ said, "Blessed are the peacemakers," did He not mean to lay chief emphasis on the word "makers" even more than on the word "peace"? So with reference to the drawing together of the Christians who acknowledge the Lordship of Christ, I cannot but believe that the great thing needed is for more Christians, one by one, not only to recognize the obligation for achieving unity but also to accept

responsibility, to take initiative, and to put forth unwearying and undiscourageable efforts to achieve their ideal.

Another hindrance unquestionably has been the lack of intimate fellowship between recognized leaders of various Christian communions. The establishment and maintenance of genuine friendships based on a like fellowship in thought and service invariably helps to generate the atmosphere, the confidence, and the sacrificial devotion so essential to the attaining of the high object in view. Possibly the most fundamental hindrance has been and still is the lack of real prayer for unity. In language concerning which there cannot be any two divergent interpretations, as well as by humbling and inspiring example, Christ has made it clear that the achievement of real Christian unity, and the resultant triumphant apologetic for the world-wide spread of his Kingdom, is a superhuman undertaking. Therefore, there is no way out in this as in other matters of vital concern, save that of going Christ's way and going in that way with Christ Himself.

Dr. Henry van Dyke, Princeton, N. J., says:—

The chief barriers to Christian unity, it seems to me, are three.

1. The vain dream of uniformity in doctrinal statements and forms of worship.

2. The superiority complex which exists in each one of many divided denominations.

3. The wide-spread ignorance of and indifference to the original ground of Christian unity, which was personal loyalty to Christ. It was this that prevented the differences of opinion between Peter and Paul, for example, from dividing these two loyal apostles from each other.

To your question as to how these barriers to Christian unity can be removed, there is only one answer: By heavenly grace.

Dean Charles R. Brown, Yale Divinity School, New Haven, Conn., says:—

The greatest obstacle to Christian unity, in my judgment, is to be found in the fact that personal and sectarian preferences touching items of polity, ritual, or theological opinion, seem more important to many people than that loyalty to and love for Christ which is the essence of our Christian faith. This barrier can only be removed by the deepening and strengthening of Christian life in the hearts of all professed followers of Christ until we are all one in the unity of the spirit, in the bond of peace, and in a finer righteousness of life.

Bishop C. P. Anderson, Episcopal Diocese of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., says:—

I consider the greatest barriers to Christian unity to be fear, pride, ignorance, established customs, and inherited prejudices.

Many people fear—and it may be a holy and well-grounded fear—that something of priceless value may be lost and that truth itself may be sacrificed in the interests of external unity. Over against this I would set the faith that removes mountains and the love that casteth out fear.

Many people take pride in what their church has done. This may be harmless, but it becomes a sin when it produces an unwillingness to confess their part in the sin of schism and to make amendments for it. Over against this I would place that humility that looketh not only on one's own things, but also on the things of others.

Dr. Raymond Calkins, First Congregational Church, Cambridge, Mass., says:—

1. The first great barrier to Christian unity is the lack of belief that any further unity is necessary. So long as churches *work* together as in the Federal Council, that is enough. It is not desirable that there should be any organic unity of the churches. All that is needed is to reduce the number of superfluous churches and to eliminate competition and friction between the great communions.

2. The second barrier is the lack of faith that any further union is possible. The progress is so slow. The gains are so few. The resistance is so great.

3. The third barrier is the obstinate resistance of the denominational consciousness to *any* kind of curtailment or modification of its denominational idea. The parallel to this in the political field is the refusal to modify in the interest of world-unity the idea of national sovereignty.

4. The fourth barrier is the failure thus far to find any formula satisfactory both to Anglican and Free Churches on which the reunion of the English speaking church can be based.

How these barriers can be removed I do not know, except by the Holy Spirit and Lord Himself.

Dr. William P. Merrill, Brick Presbyterian Church, New York, says:—

I see one great barrier in the way of church unity, so great that it leaves scarcely any others worth mentioning. Unless this one is pulled down, we cannot get at the others. And if this is put out of the way, the others will fade. The one barrier is *unchristian denominationalism.* I modify the noun because I think there is a legitimate division between denominations. We always shall have different views about theology and worship and a lot of other things, which will make it wise, if not necessary,

for us to organize in separate groups. But the thing that hinders real unity is the setting up of the tenets or ways of one group as essential.

I have found a principle which seems to me unassailable, and I believe that the adoption of it by all existing branches of the Church of Christ would bring real unity: *The only excuse a denomination has to exist, and to call itself a Christian Church, is as an attempt to realize the universal Church of Christ.* It follows from this that insistence by any church body on anything as essential to itself that is not considered by it essential to the universal Church of Christ is an impertinence, and really, in so far, disqualifies that body from rightfully using the Christian name.

I see no way in which this can be changed, save by enlightenment and persistent standing for this principle. The fact is that unwillingness to make Christ the Lord of all, with authority to decide absolutely on all points, is at the root of the whole business of division. And that is sin.

Dr. S. D. Chown, United Church of Canada, Toronto, Canada, says:—

I mention only two barriers, and they are among the greatest.

1. The institutional mind. Its temper is primarily psychological and probably inherited; but, with exercise, it unconsciously transforms itself until it assumes the guise of religious obligation. It naturally engrooves itself in conservative forms of thought which, by continuous use, fix an estimate of the value of all church organizations in proportion to their assimilation to its well defined intellectual processes.

This type of mind refuses to use reason as an instrument of progress, confining its sphere to buttressing belief in already accepted dogmas. With age it becomes more crystallized, and immune to the leadership of the spirit of God, particularly if it impinges upon theological doctrine or church polity, until, in extreme instances, it finds exceeding difficulty in comprehending the possibility of a growth of the spiritual mind.

This is one barrier, and the next is like unto it.

2. The inertia I have referred to projects itself into the sphere of moral idealism. It takes the form of indifference or antagonism to collective effort on behalf of social and economic progress. It builds the Church rather than the Kingdom of God. This lack of the spirit of hearty co-operation in the problems of the Kingdom is one of the most positive barriers to Christian unity. The lack of theological liberality and the spirit of otherness are root difficulties from which many others spring.

Bishop Edward L. Parsons, Episcopal Diocese of California, San Francisco, Calif., says:—

The chief barrier to Christian unity seems to me to lie in the attitudes of mind.

1. Moral attitudes.

The incapacity or unwillingness to understand the other point of view. Many even in most friendly discussions and conferences take what is practically a scornful attitude.

The assumption that what satisfies oneself must satisfy others, or ought to. Often accompanied by a suggestion that there is some deficiency, moral or intellectual, in the person who does not see with the same eye.

2. Intellectual attitudes.

The unscientific attitude. Huge theories built upon insufficient data. Unwillingness to include the data of the other side among those upon which the theory is to be based.

Fundamental questions not faced. Really a part of the unscientific attitude. Unwillingness to face the facts. The test of Christ in individual or corporate life is not willingly applied. For instance, so few are willing to answer the question, On what grounds agreeable to Christ's mind can a great system be built and counted as complete which definitely excludes many who know Christ?

3. Attitudes unconsciously motived.

Social and political considerations unquestionably weigh very largely. They are, for the most part, not appreciated by those concerned. Illustrations are innumerable. The schism between East and West, the various schisms from the Church of England, or the other way, the modern rapproachement of the Orthodox and Anglican communions.

4. Pretty much all Christianity seems to me to have failed to understand that love has claims prior to those of truth.

For the removal of these barriers I can only feel that conferences, at which the necessary outlines, schemes, etc., can be discussed, association in common work, such as federations, increasing knowledge of one another, and deepening religious life, are essential.

Principal W. B. Selbie, Mansfield College, Oxford, England, says:—

I think the barriers to Christian unity which are found to be most formidable in this country are:—

1. The attitude of the more extreme section of the Anglican Church in insisting upon episcopal ordination and in assent to the traditional creeds as conditions of church membership.

2. The fear of a barren uniformity, which is ingrained in many of the members of the Free Churches and leads them to suspect any kind of union closer than a mere federation.

3. The wide-spread ignorance on all sides of the position of those who belong to other churches, and the rather complacent satisfaction of all with their own position.

We have still a great deal of educational work to do in this country before there can be any real enthusiasm for the cause of reunion.

Very Rev. Dr. J. A. McClymont, Principal Clerk to the General Assembly, Church of Scotland, Edinburgh, says:—

Barriers to Christian Unity:

1. Conflicting views as to conditions of valid ministry, arising from different opinions as to seat of authority—whether in the Church itself or in historic succession of office-bearers, i.e., bishops or presbyters.

2. Estrangement due to want of fellowship in religious services.

3. Reluctance of churches to give up their independence, lest they should afterwards be drawn into principles or practices to which they are opposed.

Remedies:

1. Recognition (meanwhile) of various forms of ordination, each communion retaining its own theory of orders and forms of worship, and administering its own funds, while in other respects subject to general assembly or council.

2. Otherwise, by co-operation in good works, interchange of preachers, intercommunion and joint services,—on suitable occasions.

Dr. Francis E. Clark, World's Christian Endeavour Union, Boston, Mass., says:—

The greatest barrier to Christian unity, in my opinion, is the recrudescence of denominationalism which has marked the last few years of the history of many churches, since the collapse of the Interchurch World Movement. Not that the rank and file of Christians do not desire such unity, even more than in the past, and many of the old barriers have been thrown down. But many denominational leaders feel that one of their chief tasks is not to allow their denomination to go too far in this direction. They control vast missionary and other funds; the "vested interests" of the denomination are in their hands, and must, they think, be preserved. The home and foreign missionary work of the denomination, they feel, would be jeopardized by too close a union of the denominations and by federated churches, and interdenominational organizations must be guarded against.

Dr. Walter C. Athern of Boston University says that the two greatest perils to the religious life of the present day are secularism in education and sectarianism in religion,—which is only another way of saying that both our schools and our churches need more of the spirit of Jesus Christ.

Dr. Samuel McComb, Episcopal Theological Seminary, Cambridge, Mass., says:—

1. Unhistorical and dogmatic views as to the origin and development of ecclesiastical institutions. This leads to "unchurching" of sincere disciples of Christ. Yet historical criticism has undermined these theories, and few men in the first rank will be found to defend them. The remedy here is obvious: the dissemination of sound historical views.

2. A dull, inert acquiescence in the present order of things on the part of many, perhaps the majority of Christians. They have never had a vision of the scandal and offense caused by the spectacle of a disunited and jealous Christendom. Here again the remedy is obvious—a concerted and earnest drive upon the conscience and heart of the blind by those who see.

3. Prejudices, the result of early training, which prevent many Christians from realizing that forms of worship must vary if they are to meet the varying temperaments of men. Education, fellowship, and prayer are the remedies here.

Prof. Dr. J. Eugene Choisy, University of Geneva, Switzerland, says:—

I believe that the voice by which the unity of the Church of Christ can and ought to be realized is the voice of the federation of the churches and the coming together of Christians. The international Christian organizations: Faith and Order, Life and Work, Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations, Federation of Student Christian Associations, International Board of Missions, Salvation Army, Christian Endeavour, etc., have already largely started this collaboration. It is necessary to develop it still more.

The following should constitute a beginning:

1. A universal federation of the Protestant Evangelical churches.

2. A universal federation of the Episcopal churches (Oriental Churches, Anglican Church, Old Catholic Church, Protestant Episcopal Church of the U. S.). The heads of these two federations, *with* the representatives of the international Christian organizations, should constitute the directing body of the Church of Christ United.

Necessarily the Roman Catholic Church would remain outside, because it believes it alone is the true church founded by Christ and that it cannot join with other churches without renouncing its exclusive pretensions.

Now, the barriers which prevent the realization of a united Christendom are, as I have already said, according to the Roman Church: 1. *The sectarian spirit* (outside of myself, of my dogmas, of my organization, there is no salvation, no certain truth, no true church); then, 2. *The spirit of intellectual wrongness*, which attributes an exaggerated importance to proper

ideas, to the traditions (infinitely respectable) of the past, to certain particular dogmas, and fails to see, above all, Christ the Saviour, as the only Master, the only head of the Church, and fails to have entire confidence in the power of his spirit; finally, 3. *The wrongness of the heart,* the lack of brotherhood toward Christians of other races, of other nationalities, of other denominations.

Bishop Boyd Vincent, Episcopal Diocese of Southern Ohio, Cincinnati, says:—

Our Lord Himself defines Christian unity as spiritual unity, that is, (1) such oneness in mutual love as that of the Father and the Son; (2) so manifest that the world may believe.

I. Spiritual Barriers:

1. *Disregard of the Lord's ideal. No real, compelling desire for such unity.*

Revive constant preaching and prayer for that ideal. Desireful prayer leads to fulfilment.

2. *Racial, national, and denominational self-satisfaction.*

Revive the conception of the world-wide, catholic character of the Christian fellowship. Seek "not compromise but comprehension; not uniformity but unity."

3. *Misunderstandings of differences.*

Pursue the conference method until these are removed. "What is needed now," said Bossuet, "is not retractations but explanations."

II. Formal Barriers:

1. *In the matter of Faith: Creeds and "confessions" required as terms of baptism and communion.*

Return to the one, original New Testament term of profession of personal faith in Jesus as Christ and Son of God. A term large enough, now as then, for baptism, communion, and universal fellowship.

2. *In the matter of Order: Exclusive claims to minister the truth and grace of God.*

(a) "*Apostolic succession*"; a theory of episcopacy as not only an authoritative continuation of apostolic witness but also an exclusive channel of ministerial grace.

Abandon that and accept the facts of "the historic episcopate" as the most ancient, world-wide form of the ministry and also the most prevalent and available form to-day of a ministry universally recognizable.

(b) *Papal "supremacy."* When the Church of Rome is ready to abandon that claim, let us all return to the ancient reasonable idea of the "primacy" of the bishop of Rome as "first among equals" and so a proper external center of Christendom.

Dr. William Adams Brown, Union Theological Seminary, New York, says:—

If I were to put in a single sentence my conviction as to the greatest obstacle in the way of church unity, it would be the differences which divide the different parties in each of the churches to be united. If we can find some way to reconcile those who differ within each communion, we shall not find it impossible to bring all the churches together.

Dean Winfred Ernest Garrison, Disciples Divinity School, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., says:—

The greatest barrier to progress toward any good end is never a vice, but always a misdirected or misapplied virtue. Loyalty to Christ is the greatest dynamic for Christian service and unity. But loyalty to Christ conceived as the identification of one's own opinions, or those of one's group or coterie, with the will of Christ, is the one great obstacle to unity in Christ. Divergent opinions are no hindrance to fellowship so long as they are recognized as opinions. But opinion disguised as the infallible revelation of Divine truth or the immutable command of the Divine will is the most fruitful source of discord and division. Consequently, the most extreme examples of the sectarian and intolerant spirit has always been furnished by those who believe that they are infallibly right because they have the guidance of either an infallible church or an infallible revelation which is so simple that it does not require interpretation. For all such their very loyalty inhibits tolerance of differences.

The cure, of course, is not less loyalty but a more adequate understanding of the meaning of loyalty.

Bishop William F. McDowell, Methodist Episcopal Church, Washington, says:—

In my opinion the really serious barrier to Christian union is the lack of a deep and clear conviction that it is essential to Christian efficiency. Unity does appear desirable and necessary. Union does not seem so in any such urgent measure. This may be an utterly unreasonable attitude on the part of the churches, but I think it is their attitude in general. Indeed, I suspect that many who sincerely desire unity doubt union as a means of securing it. Many regard unity as a thing of the spirit and are not sure it can be secured by unity of form, though the latter might express the former if the former existed in power.

Dr. Finis S. Idleman, Central Church of Disciples of Christ, New York, says:—

The greatest barrier to Christian unity is the emphasis given to external authority. With some it is an appeal to the Bible in support of doctrines or practices for which a text is all-sufficient ground for separateness and exclusiveness. With still others that authority resides in a creed or in a judicatory body. The abuse of the values of all these sources of suggestion has created and still maintains the barriers between the religious forces of the world. The remedy for this evil is to be found in the mutual recognition of the presence of God in the human heart as the final test of fellowship. The exhortation to Simon Peter is still vital: "What God hath cleansed that call not thou common or unclean." Until we cease to magnify the external and look with the eyes of God upon the heart of man we shall still have our unhappy and indefensible divisions.

President Geo. W. Richards, Reformed Theological Seminary, Lancaster, Pa., says:—

The barriers to Christian union seem to me to be somewhat as follows:

1. Natural conservatism of Christians in relation to inherited forms of Christianity—doctrine, worship, government, piety.

2. Inability or unwillingness to go through intellectual, moral, and spiritual struggle that leads men from the traditional conception of Christianity to a personal, vital, and experimental Christianity, which would help the cause of church union.

3. The spirit of sectarianism closely connected with a crass biblical literalism, often nurtured by an official ministry with the best possible intention.

4. Inability to distinguish between the variables and the constants or the transient and the permanent in Christianity or in the doctrine and order of the churches.

5. The fear of losing the freedom of the individual or the group in a larger union of churches.

There is no panacea for the removal of these barriers. There has been much progress made the last fifty years. We need to speak and write about it. Those who have reached a position from which they can consistently work for union must win followers by word and deed. The general trend of things is favourable to a closer relation of the churches. I always have much confidence in the working of the spirit of truth far beyond our individual effort.

Dr. Nehemiah Boynton, Congregationalist, New York, says:—

Spiritual immaturity is a fundamental reason why the passion of Jesus has failed of general realization in the world, with relation to Christian

unity, or of other desires of his princely heart. His command is imperial: our comprehensiveness is immature. So long as we make our overdone principle of our ecclesiasticisms and theologies, and an underdone one of his Divine commands, in any regard, so long it is the gray of the morning and not high noon, in our appreciation, aspiration, and inclusive loyalty. Christianity is in the adolescent period regarding Christian unity, and a characteristic of adolescence is that it stammers where it cannot speak.

But a most grateful demonstration of to-day is that stammering in the physical world can be cured: so it can in the spiritual world! Patience and persistence: developing faith and adventurous devotion will hasten our emergence from spiritual immaturity to the fruition and realization of the Master's prayer "that they all may be one."

Dr. Joseph A. Vance, First Presbyterian Church, Detroit, Mich., says:—

One of the barriers to Christian unity is unwillingness to sacrifice denominational identity. The only way to meet this is by stressing Christ's law of sacrifice, "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone."

A second barrier is doctrinal. It works both ways. The liberal fears he will lose his liberties, and the conservative fears heresy. Neither is easy to meet until we improve our present ecclesiastical atmosphere by breathing into it more Christian esteem and confidence.

A third barrier is the perpetual strife that springs from differences in both religious temperament and intellectual attitude. This created demoninationalism, very largely, to begin with; and until we are willing to have a church broad enough to embrace them all, Christian unity will lag.

Dr. A. W. Fortune, Central Christian Church, Lexington, Ky., says:—

I have come to the conclusion that the greatest barrier to Christian unity is the denominational spirit. We do not get together because we are more anxious for our own party to succeed than we are for the extension of the Kingdom of God. When enough Christian people really want Christian union many of the obstacles that are in the way will disappear.

One does not really want Christian union until he is willing that his own communion shall be lost in the Kingdom. We have been trying to save our own communions and we have been in danger of losing the Kingdom. When we are willing that our own communions shall be swallowed up and lose their identity it will not be difficult to adjust matters that divide.

President W. A. Harper, Elon College, N. C., says:—

The greatest barriers to Christian unity, it seems to me, may be summarized as follows:

1. Pride in our religious pedigree. If we knew less church history, we could more readily agree.

2. Insistence on distinctive things, the things for which we peculiarly stand, rather than the magnifying of things on which we are agreed. Theology is a voluminous science. It is not always luminous.

3. Property rights and official positions. The only man who turned away from Christ sorrowful was the rich young ruler. He had property and held an office. If the church were over-night bereft of all property and all officers, it would unite before six o'clock in the morning.

Here are expressions from twenty-three outstanding Christian men, distinguished far beyond their communions and their countries, some in international activities and others in denominational service, but all men of such Christian integrity and catholicity of spirit that their words are of great and significant value.

The Summary

To summarize their views, they see the barriers to unity in "the lack of will to such unity," "lack of intimate fellowship," "lack of real prayer for unity," "vain dream of uniformity," "superiority complex," "wide-spread ignorance and indifference to the original ground of unity, which was personal loyalty to Christ," "personal and sectarian preferences in polity, ritual, and theology," "unchristian denominationalism," "unwillingness to sacrifice denominational identity," "doctrine," "perpetual strife in religious temperament and intellectual attitude," "fear, pride, ignorance, established custom, and inherited prejudices," "institutional mind, inertia, indifference or antagonism to collective effort," "lack of theological liberality," "lack of the spirit of otherness," "lack of belief that further unity is necessary," "lack of faith that further unity is possible," "resistance of the denominational consciousness to any kind of curtailment or modification of its denominational idea," "failure to find any formula satisfactory both to Anglicans and Free

Churches," "moral attitudes," "intellectual attitudes," "attitudes unconsciously motived," "failure to see that love has claims prior to those of truth," "conflicting views as to a valid ministry," "estrangement due to want of fellowship in religious service," "reluctance of churches to give up their independence," "misdirected and misapplied virtues," "emphasis given to external authority," "insistence of the extreme section of the Anglicans upon episcopal ordination and assent to the traditional creeds," "fear of barren uniformity," "wide-spread ignorance," "denominationalism," "sectarian spirit," "spirit of intellectual wrongness," "wrongness of the heart," "unhistorical and dogmatic views as to the origin and development of ecclesiastical institutions," "a dull, inert acquiescence in the present order of things," "prejudices," "natural conservatism in relation of inherited forms of Christianity, doctrine, worship, government, piety," "inability or unwillingness to go through intellectual, moral, and spiritual struggle," "spirit of sectarianism closely associated with a crass biblical literalism, often nurtured by official ministry with the best possible intention," "inability to distinguish between the transient and the permanent," "disregard of the Lord's ideal," "racial, national, and denominational self-satisfaction," "misunderstanding of differences," "creeds and confessions," "order of the ministry," "apostolic succession," "papal supremacy," "differences which divide the different parties in each of the churches to be united," and "spiritual immaturity."

Over against these barriers, the way to the removal of them, as suggested by these gentlemen, is by "going Christ's way and going in that way with Christ Himself," "heavenly grace," "deepening and strengthening of the Christian life," "each denomination attempting to realize the universal Church of Christ," "more Christian esteem and confidence," "fath," "love," "humility," "the Holy Spirit," "the Lord Himself," "conference," "association in common work," "knowledge," "recognition of various forms of ordination," "co-operation," interchange of preachers," "intercommunion and joint services," "a more adequate understanding of loyalty," "need in churches and

schools of more of the spirit of Christ," "coming together of Christians in world organizations," "mutual recognition of the presence of God in the human heart as the final test of fellowship," "universal federation of Protestant churches and universal federation of Episcopal churches, including Eastern Orthodox, Anglican, Protestant Episcopal, and old Catholic, with a joint board constituting the directing body of the United Church, with the Roman Catholic remaining outside because of its claim of being the true church," "working of the spirit of truth," "preaching and praying for the ideal," "catholic character of the Christian fellowship," "return to the one, New Testament term of profession of personal faith in Jesus as Christ and Son of God, " "abandoning apostolic succession for the acceptance of the historic episcopate as the most ancient and world-wide form of the ministry," "return to the ancient, reasonable idea of the primacy of the bishop of Rome as first among equals and a proper external center of Christendom," "finding the remedy to reconcile those who differ in each communion, as the way to the reconciliation of the whole," "faith and adventurous devotion," and "willingness that one's communion shall be lost in the Kingdom."

Perhaps there has never been made such a summary relative to the barriers to Christian unity and their removal by a group of such widely distributed Christian men as is herewith presented. It is a hopeful presentation. Ecclesiastical and theological barriers figure least, particularly ecclesiastical. The social and spiritual have the larger places. This is a social and spiritual age. Consequently, the emphasis in these fields is both timely and prophetic. If there could be substituted for the great denominational drives definite campaigns for interdenominational acquaintance and co-operation, much ignorance and misunderstanding would be removed and the way would be opened for closer fellowships. The greatest need now is spiritual awakening and interdenominational education, so that Christ would have a larger place in Christian lives and Christians of one communion would have first-hand knowledge

of the beliefs and practices of Christians of other communions. To this latter task neither the denominational press nor the denominational school is able to function unrestrained because their success lies largely in denominational loyalty, which, in most cases, is a sectarian attitude. If the press and the schools were to become interdenominationalized it would solve the problem in a single generation, certainly so far as Protestant unity is concerned, and, perhaps, would go far beyond that, depending on the degree of the interdenominationalization.

Since, however, that is not so easily accomplished, for it is likely that only a united Church could interdenominationalize the press and the school, other channels must be found, while, at the same time, both press and school are gradually widening in their fellowships. Perhaps they are keeping pace with the denominational spirit. Consequently, independent action is the way of the prophet. The issue is clear and every man who sees should be unafraid to speak.

One suggests the time has come for a revival of the study of Jesus as we see Him from the pages of the New Testament. Long ago John Ruskin reminded us that if we really worked together we would not have time to quarrel about our differences. Faith and love have been so pushed out of their places that every other imaginable thing has got the right of way. Faith in Jesus Christ must be so comprehended as not only to wither in our hearts all suspicion and unlove and antagonism against those Christians who differ from us, but we must possess a faith that shall be led by love to find fellowship and friendship, in spite of protests, with everyone in the fold of Christ, irrespective of denominational practices and attitudes. There has got to be some going beyond where we are if all Christians would ever find those plains of faith and love where we ought to be. Who will be ploughmen in the newer soil upon which shall be reaped the harvest of Christian unity?

PETER AINSLIE.

THE CALL TO CHRISTIAN UNION

BY REV. RALPH V. HINKLE
Rector of the Church of the Redeemer, Pendleton, Oregon

THE world is groping to-day for fellowship and brotherhood. I make this statement in spite of the fact that there are a number of divisive forces that are definitely trying to erect barriers of prejudice and intolerance in the pathway that leads to mutual understanding and co-operation. The cynic may smile his bitter smile and point to the smouldering political volcano in Italy, to the chaotic financial situation in France, to the moral, social, and economic anarchy in Russia, to the industrial crisis in England and, as for our own country, dismiss the whole situation with a shrug of the shoulders and a gesture of despair. I do not believe that the cynic is right. He is never right in the end. But there is enough truth in what he says to cause us to shudder with apprehension. It is certainly no time to go singing along life's highway with Pippa:

> God's in his heaven—
> All's right with the world.

The situation is a challenge to the Church of Jesus Christ. The world is in need of the message of "Peace on earth, good-will to men." It is in need of the gospel of love and brotherhood. But where can it hear such a message? Why from the Church, of course. Yes, the answer is correct. The Church, in spite of its sins of division, has lifted its voice with this message of love. But the tragedy is that this voice has often been drowned by the discordant voices of controversy and heated animosity. The Church may say to this quarreling, warring, divided world, "Learn the way of love and peace." But the world can reply, "Physician, heal thyself." The time has come when we must recognize that divisions within the Church of Jesus Christ

constitute not only a sin against economy and efficiency, but they must be labeled as nothing less than treason against Christ and his Kingdom. There is no problem facing the Church to-day quite as pressing as Christian unity.

The progress toward this goal seems at times pitifully slow and uncertain. But progress there has been. If we look back over the advance made in the past two decades, we can find some cause for encouragement. The Student Volunteer Movement, the Laymen's Missionary Movement, the Missionary Education Movement, and the ill-fated Inter-Church World Movement have demonstrated the fact that the Church recognizes that the work of conquering the world for Christ is a task for a united Church. The Federal Council of Churches and one of its children—the Home Missions Council—testify to the conviction that there must be some united effort if the work of Christian education, social service, church extension, and evangelism is to be successfully carried forward. And then our hearts have been gladdened by the consummation of several minor union movements. The Baptists and Free Baptists have united. Several branches of the Lutheran Church have come together. A similar movement is on foot in the Presbyterian Church. And in Canada, the Methodist, Presbyterian, and Congregational Churches have been transformed into the United Church of Canada. And a World Conference on Faith and Order to be held in Lausanne this year causes us to hope that the prayer of our Master, "that they all may be one," may speedily be realized.

There are many barriers in the way of bringing this movement to a successful consummation, some of them apparently insurmountable. I do not have time to go into them in detail, but there are two mistaken attitudes of mind that have barred the way to success.

The first is that attitude which assumes that success can come only by perfect agreement—that all that cannot be agreed upon must be set aside. In other words, all distinctive forms, ceremonies, doctrines, creeds, types of government, *et cetera,*

must be abandoned. That only that irreducible minimum of doctrine and practice be retained upon which all can agree. The result of this process can leave only an organization and a service of worship "without form and void." A thing which nobody knows and with which nobody is satisfied. It is doomed to failure before it has had a good start. It may be that all that is lost are husks. But we must remember that even husks have an essential place in the economy of nature. Religious convictions form a protective covering for our spiritual lives and must not lightly be cast aside.

This brings me to the second attitude that has so effectually barred progress toward the solution of this problem, namely, the confusion of that which is *essential* to our spiritual lives with that which is *fundamental* in Christianity. We have found that certain doctrinal beliefs have strengthened our faith, that certain devotional practices have enriched our spiritual lives, that certain other practices have had the opposite effect. We have found from the testimony of others that they have had the same experience. So our convictions have been even more firmly established until finally we are ready to announce to the world that we have the only real approach to the throne of the Almighty.

Are people with this turn of mind opposed to Christian unity? Not at all. They are, on the other hand, quite anxious to see it consummated. But their idea of unity is to have all other Christians come around to their position. The most outstanding example of this attitude is the Roman Catholic Church. In the address of the Papal Legate at the Eucharistic Congress, held recently in Chicago, he expressed the hope that Christian unity might soon be realized. But it was a unity in which all were to return to the Church of Rome in complete submission to the infallible authority of the Pope. We smile at the rather naive assumption. But I wonder if we are not all, consciously or unconsciously, in somewhat the same frame of mind? We would all like to have people come our way. I would like to see all of you become Episcopalians. And no doubt those of you

who are followers of Alexander Campbell would like to have everybody become Disciples. And I suspect that the Methodists, Presbyterians, and Baptists would all like to see everybody coming to them.

I was talking a few years ago with a young Congregational minister, with whom I was quite intimately acquainted, about the proposed Concordat between Episcopal and Congregational Churches. He said to me, "The trouble is that you Episcopalians want us to become Episcopalians." I pointed out that we were making just about as many concessions as we were asking them to make. I did not seem to convince him so I asked for his idea of a united Church. "First of all," he answered, "it should have a democratic form of government. Then it must have no authoritative creeds, or rituals, or disciplines. And it must have no person or group of persons with any ecclesiastical authority over the local congregation." I then asked him to explain the distinctive principles of Congregationalism. "First of all, a Congregational church has a democratic form of government," he replied. "And then it has no creed, set ritual, or authoritative discipline. And it has no one above the local congregation — Say, what are you trying to do?" he asked with a smile. He had fallen into the trap. Yes, we all want the world to come our way.

This in itself would not be so bad if it did not develop a Pharisaical attitude of superiority toward all other forms of worship and religious expression. How often we hear people speak of the worship of others as empty formalism or cold intellectualism or decadent conservatism or high-strung emotionalism. We are prone to forget that there are various temperaments that are appealed to in various ways, that is, what is significant to one is meaningless to others. A few months ago, one of the members of my church was telling of attending a special evening service at one of the other churches. She compared the efforts of the song leader with the antics of a cheerleader at a football game. And remarked that it seemed more like a theater than a church. Now it happens that I have

dropped in at the same church once or twice and I am free to confess that I liked it. I did not happen to agree with all that the preacher said, but I did get a real spiritual uplift from those good old gospel songs. I love to hear the message of redeeming love sung from hearts that have felt its glow. This good Christian lady had entered a service of worship that was strange and unfamiliar and her mind was diverted from the real spirit of it. And, on the other hand, I have had people come to me with the complaint that our service was just a lot of getting up and sitting down. And I have heard some say as they left that it was a "good show." They, too, have missed that mystical inner spirit that makes our service a very real, as well as a beautiful, approach to the throne of grace.

We sometimes think that divisions are comparatively new but, when we go back to apostolic times, we find that divisions existed even then. In St. Paul's first epistle to the Corinthians, the very first chapter, he pleads "that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment. For it hath been declared unto me . . . that there are contentions among you." And then he tries to show how foolish it is for some to say "I am of Paul; and I of Apollos; and I of Cephas; and I of Christ." In the twelfth chapter of the same epistle he explains how there may be different types of Christian experience and various ways of expressing it. "Now there are diversities of gifts but the same spirit. And there are diversities of administrations, but the same Lord. And there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all." Then he speaks of the unity which exists between the various members of the body and uses it as an illustration of how the various members of the Church should live together in unity.

But the final appeal to unity is made in the thirteenth chapter, described by someone as the most beautiful passage in all literature, certainly the most beautiful in all of St. Paul's writings. Here he recognizes the essential character of the

various types of Christian experience. There is the emotional, the prophetic, the mystical, the doctrinal approach, even the avenue of service and sacrifice. But he points out that none of them are really fundamental. That without love they are nothing. If he were writing to-day, he might say: Even though I speak with such eloquence that crowds come to hear me preach and hundreds are nightly swept into the Kingdom on the wave of a great emotional appeal, if I have not love in my heart, I am as sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal. And though I prophesy with all the stern denunciation of an Elijah or a John the Baptist or a Jonathan Edwards or a Billy Sunday; and though I have an intellect that is brilliant and a mind that can understand all the theological problems; and though I conduct the services of the Church and administer the sacraments in such a manner that people are brought into the mystical presence of God, and have not love, I am nothing. And though I enter into all sorts of social service and make such sacrifices that life itself is finally given, and have not love, it profiteth me nothing.

So St. Paul maintains that the only thing that is truly fundamental is love. It is the one thing that will endure. "Love never faileth: but whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be tongues, they shall cease; whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away." It is all so perfectly simple, but somehow, when it comes to the application of this principle to the divided condition that exists in the Church to-day, we do not seem to have the imagination or the grace to really put it into effect. It is still hard for us to make a distinction between that which is essential to our spiritual experience and that which is fundamental in Christianity.

There are those who have experienced a great emotional release at the time of conversion, and worship to them must have its emotional element. While others have heard a still small voice whispering to them in some hour of meditation, and worship to them must have its element of mystical contemplation. Others have been kept from the Kingdom by a mis-

understanding of some of the doctrinal statements of the Church. Then some preacher has explained the teaching so clearly that the difficulty has been banished and they have felt free to come into the Church and enter a life of Christian service. For them worship must have an intellectual content. Still others have beheld the "Lord, high and lifted up" in some liturgical service, and for them worship does not seem like worship that is not cast in some ritualistic form.

The world would suffer a great spiritual loss if any of these avenues of approach to the throne of mercy should be closed. Yet many think of Christian unity in terms of closing all approaches except the one that they have followed to the great heart of God. We are all more or less like a man standing on the shore of a lake, seeing for the first time the moon rising out of the water. He beholds a glorious pathway of light leading from his very feet to the moon itself. It is the only path of light coming across the whole lake. He feels rather sorry for those who are down the shore a way. So he calls to a friend some distance away to come and behold the path of light that comes to his very feet. The friend calls back: "You are wrong; the path of light comes to my feet." An argument follows, a controversy develops, bitterness comes in and a friendship is broken. "How silly," I hear some of you say. "No one would do that." Of course not. Yet in the spiritual world this very thing has been done ever since the time of the great apostle. And as a result we behold to-day the tragedy of a divided Church. Each division with its group of adherents standing upon some well-defined position along the shore of the great sea of life beholding the light from the great White Throne come to them in a path of glory. They can see for themselves that there is no other path of light. All others are misguided souls standing in darkness.

If we could only get all Christians to leave the group where they are now and go to some other group with quite a different position and outlook and stay there for a few months or a year and then move on to still another and another, we would find

all, or most of them, glad to get back to the group from whence they started. Just as a tired globe-trotter is glad to get back to his native home. But, with the exception of a few who might wear the dark spectacles of prejudice, and thus blind themselves from seeing anything good in any other position than their own, they would also bring back with them a spirit of religious cosmopolitanism and catholicism that would greatly simplify, if not actually solve, the problem of Christian unity. At least we would no longer be hurling stinging epithets at one another.

Conservatism may be a deadening influence, but, filled with the spirit of love, it becomes a gyroscope, keeping our spiritual flights from taking a nose-dive. Intellectualism may be cold and unsympathetic, but, lighted with the torch of love, the quest for truth becomes a high and holy adventure. Emotionalism may be a flame from a bit of spiritual tinder that flares up and burns out, but, if it is kindled from the flame of love, it becomes a purifying fire purging us from all dross and iniquity. Formalism may be empty and meaningless, but, illuminated by love, it becomes glorious even as dull gray clouds are transformed and glorified by the rays of the departing sun.

Let us realize that "we know in part, and we prophesy in part," that we are still spiritual children, speaking, understanding, sometimes quarreling, as children. But the time will come when we will grow into the stature of full manhood. When that time comes we will no longer "see through a glass darkly, but then face to face." We will no longer "know in part," but then shall we "know even as also" we are "known." I believe that this time will come, for we have faith to keep us steadfast, hope to beckon us on, and love to transform us "from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord." "And now abideth faith, hope, love, these three; but the greatest of these is love."

RALPH V. HINKLE.

IS CHURCH UNION ATTAINABLE?*

BY GEORGE W. RICHARDS, D.D., LL.D.

President of the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in the U. S., Lancaster, Pa.

In the effort for church union we must go back to the teachings of the apostles that we may go forward to the ideals of the Christ. Paul was true to the mind of the Master when he wrote to the Corinthians: "There are diversities of gifts but the same Spirit"—"They are many members but one body." Among Christian individuals and groups there is to be the relation of unity in diversity, unity of spirit and diversity of form and function. This is not something that Christians have achieved and lost; but something that they must strive for and gain.

In Catholicism we have uniformity without diversity, authority without freedom; in Protestantism we have division without unity, freedom without authority. Neither the one nor the other has reached the apostolic ideal. The church of the future, if it is to be true to Christ and to the Christian, must preserve the values of Catholicism and of Protestantism, advance beyond both into a fellowship that is catholic and evangelical and provides for unity of spirit and diversity of forms, the free activity of the individual controlled by respect for the authority and welfare of the body.

I

The agitation for church union naturally came in the wake of the war. For years men were driven to united action both at home and on the field. Under the stress of a great cause, in whatever terms it was defined by the opposing belligerents, men worked together and fought together. They forgot for the time being their social, national, and religious differences and came

* This article appears simultaneously in *The Crozier Quarterly.*

under the impulse of new motives, which they fervently believed had for their goal, the material and the spiritual advancement of the race. Rarely, if ever, in human history, did men unite in so far-reaching and effective ways for the accomplishment of a definite purpose. White and coloured races, among others, French, Italian, English, Americans and Japanese to speak only of the allied armies, Catholics, Protestants, Jews, nobles and peasants, men, women, and children, joined hand and heart to supply the necessities, to bear the burdens, and to win the victory, of war.

On the field of battle the soldiers felt more keenly the necessity of united action than the civilian at home. Men stood in the trenches in winter's cold and summer's heat, faced for months running into years, the ceaseless and deadly fire of the enemy, felt the pangs of disease and saw death in its most hideous forms working havoc among their comrades. In circumstances like these, the things which divided them grew small and the things which united them loomed large. They began to realize that they were men before they were nationals and that they were Christians before they were sectarians. They were men with like passions, suffering, bleeding, dying; they were Christians in need of comfort, sympathy, strength, life, and love such as can be found only in a Christ-like God. The divisive things in religion appeared as transient forms, which serve a purpose but have their day and cease to be,—forms of doctrine, government, worship. The uniting things in religion appeared as eternal and unchangeable realities, more fixed than the stars above or the earth beneath, which alone enable men to face life and death joyously and triumphantly—God, providence, righteousness, sin, Jesus Christ, the Saviour and Lord, forgiveness, mercy, brotherhood, eternal life. Thus the essential unity of humanity and of Christianity, too often unrecognized or forgotten in times of peace and prosperity, was rediscovered by men who were compelled to meet almost insuperable difficulties, to bear intolerable burdens, and to suffer unspeakable anguish.

When the solders returned and met the citizens at home, the question naturally arose, why can we not, as nations and

churches, work together in times of peace as well as fight together in times of war; work together, not to destroy an enemy, but to build the Kingdom of righteousness and love, justice and peace, into the hearts of men and into the lives of nations? Among the people still bleeding from the wounds of war and deeply grieving for their dead, young men saw visions and old men dreamt dreams of a new internationalism and a new interdenominationalism, a fellowship of nations in the form of a league and a fellowship of churches in the form of federation or organic union. While the first glow of enthusiasm for united action was chilled by the unexpected recrudescence of nationalism and of denominationalism, the movement for closer co-operation cannot be permanently checked. Under the irrepressable urge of the spirit of truth and love, no less than of the necessities growing out of the modern struggle for life, we have a reasonable hope that the will to unite and to co-operate among nations and churches will in due time be victorious.

A third factor has quietly and persistently worked for church union. What the soldiers and citizens have come to realize through the stern discipline and the bitter experience of war, the scholar has discovered through patient investigation and clear thinking. In most of the theological schools of Europe and America, the teachers no longer interpret the Bible in the light of dogmas but they interpret dogmas in the light of the Bible. They approach the books of the Old and the New Testament with the aid of the grammatical and historical method of interpretation—to find out what the writers wished to say and not what the dogmaticians have thought they ought to have said.

Moreover, they are distinguishing, also, between the realities upon which the Christian experience is based and the intellectual statements and institutional forms by which the Christian experience is defined and propagated. Definitions and institutions vary at different times and places, depending upon degrees of culture, temperament, and racial genius. The spiritual realities themselves are immutable, the same yesterday, to-day, and forever. Thus a sound and unprejudiced Christian scholarship supports the unreasoned but none the less sane in-

tuitions of a Christian laity. They recognize the relative value of denominational and sectarian forms and the absolute value of the spiritual and ethical content of Christian revelation; they see ever more clearly the distinction between the churches and the Kingdom of God, and that the churches are not an end in themselves but a means for the establishment of the rule of righteousness and love. The more men will come under the power of that conviction the less will they find satisfaction in making the denomination or sect the end of their endeavours, but they will freely subordinate their respective churches to the wider and deeper purposes of the Kingdom of God.

II

To understand the possibilities of church union at present and in the future, we need to consider the various reasons for the divisions among Christians in the past. The possibility of sect and schism was a necessary consequence of the freedom with which Christ made men free. He delivered them from the authority of officials, laws, customs, and rites, sanctioned by ages of usage, and gave them the very responsible and dangerous privilege of freedom in the spirit; freedom from coercion of law that they might live spontaneously in the power of love. Notwithstanding the dangers involved in the gift of Jesus, it was the only way by which the highest purpose of God for men could be attained. The venture was not without its disasters but it was well worth while.

One ought not be surprised, therefore, to discover that Christians from the beginning were not a united and harmonious group. Jesus brought not peace but a sword. The Jewish Christians bitterly opposed Paul and his mission. In the Corinthian congregation some claimed to be of Paul, others of Apollos; some of Cephas and others of Christ. In the first four centuries the very existence of Christianity was jeopardized by sects and schisms, among which were Gnosticism, Marcionism, Montanism, Arianism, Nestorianism, and Donatism. All these professed to be Christian and claimed apostolic authority.

Only an official and creedal Catholicism seemed to be able to save the Church from dissolution and absorption in the whirl of philosophic speculations, oriental mysteries, Jewish laws, and vulgar paganism. Scores of sects disturbed the Church through the Middle Ages; and in the sixteenth century Western Catholicism was disrupted and divisions increased to such an extent that the ills of sectarianism were almost as deplorable as the abuses of Roman Catholicism.

Various reasons have been given for the rise of divisions in the Church. The ancient Catholic fathers rather too easily disposed of them by tracing them to demoniacal action; in other words, to the fraud and malice of the devil. While it may be a secret satisfaction to say that an opponent comes from the devil and, if it please God, he may go to the devil, the modern historian is not satisfied with this theory of the ancient churchmen.

Nor will it suffice to find the reason for the divisions of the Church in the ambitions, ignorance, or stubbornness of men who were religious leaders in their day. Doubtless the personal element always plays a part in human affairs, secular and ecclesiastical. But the various churches of to-day cannot be accounted for merely in this way. Luther and Zwingli failed to join hands at Marburg because they were men of sincerity and truth. So far as they could see at that time, union required a sacrifice of personal conviction, which would have been far more deplorable than division. Whatever we may wish these founders of Protestantism to have done, no intelligent person will charge them with seeking personal aggrandizement or with lack of consecration to the cause of Christ, when they separated never to meet again.

A careful inquiry into the origin of the various churches, I think, shows that most of them had their beginning in an irrepressible conviction that a devout man had re-discovered the Christianity of Jesus and the apostles; and that, as he found it, it did not then prevail in the existing churches. Accordingly, with the spirit of a prophet and the ardour of an apostle, he proclaimed his new gospel, gathered converts, and founded a

new church. Men of this kind may have been in error, bigoted and intolerant, but one cannot charge them with insincerity and dishonesty. They were true to their convictions and were ready to undergo hardships of every sort to promote the cause of Christ.

If men have been driven into sect and schism by earnest devotion to the Christian ideal as they saw it, it is possible, also, that when they come under the power of a wider and deeper vision of the Christ they will, in the same spirit of sincerity and truth, unite in a fellowship more in harmony with the ideal of Jesus and Paul, when there will be one body with many members.

III

The divisions that came through the Reformation in the sixteenth century were both a loss and a gain.

Christians lost the fellowship of brethren, which is an essential element in the household of faith. Jesus united men in works of faith, labours of love, and the patience of hope. They continued steadfastly in the apostles' teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of bread and the prayers (Acts 2:42). They joined in worship, in benevolence, and in hospitality. The pagans cried: "How these Christians love one another!" Through divisions, which came into the Church later on, hatred, strife, and persecutions arose among Christians. One finds trails of blood leading from one sect to the other. The five chapels in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem, reserved for as many different groups, were guarded, at least before the war, by Mohammedan police who kept the worshipers from assaulting one another in the house of God. The pagans of a later age might have reversed a cry of old and said: "Behold how these Christians hate one another!" Happily, the attitude of churches toward one another to-day has changed and men are recognizing not only the Christians of other churches but also the churches of other Christians.

In a divided Church men, also, lost the ability of collective action for the conversion of the world to Christ and for fighting

the various evils in the world often arrayed in powerfully organized forms. Co-operation of Christian forces seems indispensable for the fulfilment of the missionary task of the Church—the evangelization of a billion souls scattered over a vast portion of the earth. In *The Christian Movement in China,* 1923, we are told that "about one hundred denominational groups are striving to present one message to China. In their striving they divide China into two hundred spheres of denominational influence." This lack of concentration and united effort is generally felt to be one of the great hindrances to effective missionary activity. Dr. DeForest once said: "We have disobeyed the instructions of our Chief who commanded us to have such a conspicuous unity as would conclusively demonstrate to the world that He was divinely sent from heaven to bring all men into brotherhood."

The evil effects of sectarianism are becoming more and more evident in our own land. In hundreds of towns, with a thousand or two thousand souls, there are from four to eight congregations of different faith and order. It is almost criminal for the leaders of the churches to ask red-blooded and consecrated young men, who graduate from theological seminaries after long years of study, to spend their lives in communities in which there ought to be one church instead of six. To put a man in such a place is not to give him a field but to put him into a hole. This mode of procedure was once praised as denominational loyalty; but in the clearer light of to-day it appears as nothing less than sectarian bigotry.

The waste of money in over-churched communities is second only to the unnecessary expenditure of virile manhood in the service of the Kingdom. True, Christian men and women have never permitted themselves to be controlled by financial considerations in the propagation and defense of their religious convictions; for these they have been ready to hazard even their lives. But the time may come when it becomes an unpardonable offense to spend money in support of religious institutions after the original reasons for their independent existence have lost their force. A Methodist bishop recently said that scores of

missionaries might be supported on the foreign field with the salaries of janitors in the unnecessary churches of the villages and towns of the United States. Intelligent laymen, who are no longer in the grip of outlived sectarian ideas, are beginning to count the cost of colleges and seminaries, of churches and chapels, of different denominations when the number of these institutions might be reduced without loss of efficiency for the cause of Christ and the communities which they serve. Indeed, the union of schools and congregations would satisfy the better judgment and the deeper religious insight of many intelligent and devout people at the present time.

The men of the world in this respect are wiser than the children of light. In the late war the allied armies were vacillating, now advancing and then retreating, until they were brought under the control and direction of a single commander. It was only when Marshall Foch had his eye on twenty-three fronts and each army and battalion was moved as one body toward a common objective that the tide of battle changed and the Central Powers had to yield to the irresistible onslaught of a united foe.

The divisions of Protestantism are not without compensations. Indeed, the only way of escape from the uniformity and domination of the medieval church was through the affirmation of the right of protest which presupposed the prerogative of individual initiative in thought and action. The believers rediscovered their rights as prophets, priests, and kings and the dawn of democracy broke upon the Western world. The privilege of the individual and the group to worship God according to the dictates of conscience was bought at too great a price ever to be surrendered again. It may be taken for granted that any plan of union, in the future, that would jeopardize this right would not for a moment receive favourable consideration from the modern man.

Through the divisions in the Church new aspects of truth have been made manifest. The revelation of God in Christ was recorded and defined in the New Testament not by one man but by many men from different points of view and with dif-

ferent natural talents and spiritual gifts. In the history of Christianity truth becomes comprehensible through life in distinctive persons. The leaders of the different Christian groups in many lands have served as media through which the light that shines from the face of Jesus Christ has become visible to the common man. One does not dream of the wealth of colour hidden in the pure white sun-ray. When it shines through a many-sided prism upon an opposite wall, it displays all the colours of the rainbow. Its wealth was concealed until the ray was dissolved in its component parts by passing through an intervening crystal. Even so the white light of truth that emanates from Jesus Christ must pass through great personalities and through racial and national groups, before one can comprehend the height and depth, the length and breadth, of the love of God in Jesus Christ.

While we recognize the gains achieved through Protestantism, we see, none the less clearly, that it is no more the final form of Christian fellowship than Catholicism. Christians are discontented and are seeking closer union of churches because they are catching glimpses of a higher unity in which there will be a blend of the best elements of Catholicism and Protestantism. May we hope for an Evangelical Catholicism combining the oneness of the one with the diversity of the other?

IV

The question of primary interest is, how may the divisions be reconciled and a united Church be re-established? The nobler spirits of an age have always deplored sect and schism as both unchristian and unprofitable. The Diet of Augsburg (1530) was called in the hope of "restoring the unity of the holy empire of the German nation in the one true Christian religion and church." Archbishop Cranmer sent his celebrated letter, March 20, 1552, to John Calvin of Geneva, urging the calling of an assembly of "learned and godly men" in order that they might come to agreement on the doctrines of Christianity. Calvin, in his reply, wrote the oft-repeated words: "As far as I am con-

cerned, if I can be of any service I shall not shrink from crossing ten seas, if need be, for that object." Throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries there were men in Great Britain and on the Continent who lived and laboured for church union, some for the union of all Protestants and others for the reunion of Catholics and Protestants. The only form of union then sought for was organic union based on doctrinal agreement. The dissenting sects were not invited to councils and colloquies held in the interest of church union.

Not until the nineteenth century were plans of closer relation between the churches, such as, alliance, council, and federation, thought of and proposed. These proposals came out of a change of mood among the churches. Hostile competition turned into friendly recognition, sectarian intolerance into denominational alliance or federation. The polemical spirit was changed into an irenical spirit. Accordingly the nineteenth century stands out as the century of closer relations among the churches. The Evangelical Alliance was organized in England in 1846 and in the United States in 1867. All the evangelical churches of Europe and America were eligible to membership in this Alliance. Churches of the same family, also, entered into alliance, notably: "The Alliance of the Reformed Churches holding the Presbyterian System throughout the World," which was organized in 1875. "The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America," organized in 1908, includes about thirty evangelical churches of the United States. A Conference of the Christian Churches throughout the World on Life and Work was held in 1925 in Stockholm, Sweden. And an Ecumenical Conference on Faith and Order is to be held in August, 1927, at Lausanne, Switzerland.

There remains only one more step to be taken, if there is to be progress in the union movement, and that leads to organic union. There are those who are opposed to it for reasons that cannot be lightly disposed of. They prefer merely alliance and federation among the churches. Of one thing we may be certain, that the only form of union that leads us beyond the present

status of the churches is organic union. If that is not desirable, then we ought to cease further agitation of the whole matter.

What does organic union imply? It does not mean that one church absorb other churches. That would be a merger without honour, in which the identity of the smaller bodies would be lost in the larger body, without actual advance toward the apostolic ideal of Christian fellowship. Protestants might accept the friendly invitation of the Roman Catholic Church to enter the fold of what is claimed to be the one and only Holy Catholic Apostolic Church. Protestant bodies might unite with other Protestant churches on one or the other of the bases of union which have recently been proposed. Such procedure would be far from organic union. It would merely be absorption, which would require a sacrifice of personal convictions and self respect, which none should be asked to make. I hold that there is not a church in the world to-day into which all the other churches would, or ought to, enter in order to reunite Christendom. Such a theory presupposes a conception of Christianity and of the Christian Church, which is no longer tenable and which will forever prevent organic union.

Let us consider in detail what is really involved in organic union in distinction from alliance or federation. Each church is both a corporation and an organism. The corporation is the product of, and exists for, the organism. As a corporation it is controlled by law; its laws may be modified when necessity or utility requires it, without destroying the organism. Such modifications are made when churches enter into an alliance or a federation. Each church, however, maintains its identity and the original organism of each of the allied or federated churches remains intact. The establishment of alliances and federations is comparatively easy since no change of identity or of the vital process of the several bodies is necessary.

Organic union requires a change not only of corporation but, also, of organism of each of the uniting churches. The churches must cease to be what they were separately and become something, other than they were, in the union. A new organism, containing the substance of the organisms that are united, must

be created; and such creative power must come from God. A Divine ideal must lay hold of the churches and out of them a new Church will be born. It is new not only in its corporate form but in its organic life—new in that it has taken into its being and life the best of each of the churches, which has been transformed by the Spirit of Christ into something more than all the separated churches had attained.

Organic union, in this view, is a creative act of God in the bosom of Christian men and women. It cannot be achieved by human effort alone, although men must work into ecclesiastical forms to embody what God creates in the heart of the churches. Plans of union are of little avail unless they register, in clear phrase, what God Himself has wrought in the minds of his people. When the way for union has been prepared by Divine action, men cannot resist its coming; without such preparation men will labour in vain to effect it.

Organic union must come with a new conception of Christianity—not a new Christianity, but a new interpretation of Christianity. Divided Christendom is the logical outcome of a distinctive view of Christianity which underlies both Catholicism and Protestantism. It differs in form in the various churches, but in principle it is the same in all of them. It may be defined somewhat as follows:

Christianity is divinely revealed doctrine and a divinely authorized institution; the truth and life, which come from God, are supposed to be conveyed to men through the doctrines and the institution and are contained in the Bible. The men and women who have found the true doctrine and the authorized institution, constitute the Church of the Living God. Each communion claims to have discovered the Divine Way — the Greek Catholics, the Roman Catholics, the Episcopalians, the Baptists, the Lutherans, the Calvinists, the Quakers. The fact that each church through its founder has made the great discovery is the only reason for its separate existence. Of necessity each church must regard the churches of a different faith and order as defective, if not heretical and schismatical. This conception of Christianity leads to intolerance and exclusion,

to bigotry and proselyting. As long as men are controlled by it, there can be no organic union. The only union that can be thought of is a merger; that is, the merging of all the churches into one of the existing bodies which would be recognized as the only true Church of Christ. It would be union by proselyting; a sacrifice of what men for centuries have considered essential elements of Christianity. Such a sacrifice would amount to self-annihilation.

There is, however, another conception of Christianity which is gradually pervading the churches. According to this view Christianity is a life before it is a doctrine and an institution. The life is begotten in the soul of man by the spirit of God proceeding from Christ and Him glorified. It manifests itself in a new attitude and disposition toward the ultimate realities of human life—in a new faith, a new hope, and a new love. The source of life is Jesus Christ, the creative power is his Spirit, and the seat of life is the soul of man. Thus, men become new creatures, new in their motives and in their purpose. They live in the faith and hope and love of a Christ-like God.

The new life will necessarily express itself in a variety of forms, depending upon nationality, temperament, previous heritage, and degrees of culture. There will be, as there have been, diversities of doctrinal and institutional forms, but in the diversity there will be unity of spirit—a common faith, hope, and love. There will always be variables and a constant in Christianity. In the constant, the spirit of trust and love and hope, men will find unity and a basis for the fellowship of brethren in Christ. In the variables—forms of doctrine, modes of worship, types of piety—men will find room for the development of the almost infinite diversity of forms which always goes the highest order of life.

V

Are the Evangelical churches of the United States prepared for organic union? Clearly not, if they have not advanced to a conception of Christianity that will as naturally unite the

churches as the old conception divided them. For organic union must come by vital process under the power of a vital principle. It cannot be brought about by synodical resolutions. These are only the records of the Spirit's action in the hearts of Christians.

To affect organic union without corresponding spiritual transformation of the denominations would be a consummation devoutly to be deplored. For it would end in dismal failure. So long as a plan of organic union can be defeated, it ought to be defeated. When, under the power of the Spirit of Christ, the churches are ready for such union, it will come with irresistible force. Men can no more stop it than they can beget it. At most they can only formulate and direct it.

There are, however, evidences indicating that in the mind and heart of American Christians, there is a spirit working for a union of the churches closer than that of a council or a federation, nothing less than organic. Men feel instinctively that Christianity is a life that manifests itself in works of faith, labours of love, and patience of hope. Where that life is, there is Christ, there is the Church, there are brethren. The basis for union, therefore, is not a system of doctrine, a form of church government, a mode of worship, or an initiatory rite, but a spirit of life wrought by God through Christ and his works in the hearts of men.

Christians, the world over, are feeling that there is something greater than a denomination or than all denominations, and that is the Kingdom of God for which all denominations exist. Once it was presumed that the Kingdom was coextensive with a particular church and men were brought into the Kingdom through the door of a church. Such a view necessarily ends in sectarianism and bigotry, though it is held with sincerity and deep conviction, and often with an enthusiasm that makes martyrs. Now, however, men are coming under the grip of a new idea of the Kingdom of God, the reign of righteous love as manifested by God in Christ, in the universe of matter and mind and in the hearts of men and nations. All the churches serve its end and find their true mission and glory in working together for its establishment throughout the world. This new

vision of the Kingdom enables us to see in their true perspective the things that once divided the churches, things which recede into the background and diminish in size as Christ and his Kingdom loom large and increase in importance in thought and action.

While men choose to work in different ways, to worship in different forms, and to define the objects of revelation and of Christian experience in different terms, they are Christian only as they live and die for the Kingdom, not because they are Episcopalian, Lutheran, Baptist, Presbyterian, or Congregational. In time these denominational names will be known only in history and the groups which they now designate will be united in a Christian communion in which men will be co-workers with God in Christ in the Spirit of faith, hope, and love.

GEORGE W. RICHARDS.

INTOLERANCE

Across the way my neighbour's windows shine,
His roof-tree shields him from the storms that frown;
He toiled and saved to build it, stanch and brown,
And though my neighbour's house is not like mine,
I would not pull it down!

With patient care my neighbour, too, had built
A house of faith, wherein his soul might stay,
A haven from the winds that sweep life's way.
It differed from my own—I felt no guilt—
I burned it yesterday!

—*Molly Anderson Haley.*

CHURCH UNION AND THE QUESTION OF CREED IN AUSTRALIA

BY REV. ANDREW R. OSBORN
Ormond College, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia

THE movement for church union in Australia is, for the time, in abeyance. For twenty years it was in the forefront of discussion in Congregational, Methodist, and Presbyterian church courts; then an adverse vote in Presbyterian Assemblies brought it to a standstill, and convinced even the most ardent supporters of the movement that, for at least a decade, further discussion was useless. It would be hard to estimate what part difficulties regarding creed played in the adverse vote, and some might even affirm that they had little to do with it. Those, however, who have studied the development of the movement realize that, although, in the early stages, doctrinal questions seemed to offer little material for contention, as negotiations advanced they played an increasingly important part, and that dissatisfaction with the creedal statement prepared for acceptance was by no means a negligible factor in the vote which finally brought the movement to a temporary close. Not only so, but many who voted for union and were enthusistic in the cause affirm that, when the proposal is revived, as it inevitably must be, some other method must be devised for dealing with the statement of belief; otherwise the new movement will be as futile as the one now ended. The purpose of this article is to indicate briefly the method followed by those who directed the union movement, its defects, and the different line of action which, in the opinion of some, should be adopted in the future. It is hoped that the views set forth may have some interest and value for churches in America, which, like ourselves, cannot evade the demand to end the present system of denominationalism and form a united church with larger ideals and a broader basis.

It is not a little curious that the Presbyterian Church, which brought the effort for organic union to an end, was the church which initiated the proposal. In the year 1900 the Presbyterian churches in the six states of the Commonwealth of Australia united and formed the Presbyterian Church of Australia. The first General Assembly of the united church was held in Sydney in July 1901. In his inaugural address the Moderator, the Rev. John Meiklejohn, fired doubtless by the spirit of enthusiasm accompanying the successful termination of the union negotiations among Presbyterians, foreshadowed a larger union embracing other evangelical bodies. "We Presbyterians," he declared, "love our church, and have some reason to be proud of her history, but we do not hold all statements of her creed of equal value, nor all principles of her polity of equal importance." These sentiments were evidently shared by the Assembly, for a committee was appointed by it to "consider the question of a larger union."

The committee thus appointed realized that the first problem facing them was that of creed, but no serious difficulties in that direction were anticipated. There had been no debate regarding creed in the Presbyterian negotiations for an Australian union, for the reason that a solution had been found years before by the adoption of a Declaratory Statement defining the sense in which men bound themselves to the doctrines of the Westminster Confession of Faith, the subordinate standard of the Presbyterian Church. It was scarcely to be expected that other churches would adopt the Presbyterian standard, but there was hope that some simple statement or formula might be devised which would render long discussions regarding doctrine unnecessary. In negotiations between Presbyterian and Congregational churches in the state of New South Wales in 1902 the doctrinal statement embodied in the Act of Incorporation of the Congregational Union of New South Wales, consisting of eleven short articles, was set side by side with the brief summary of belief in the Declaratory Statement of the Presbyterian Church. There was no radical difference between

them, and the representatives of the two churches were of opinion that doctrinal differences should offer no obstacle to union, but they thought that, if a new formula were devised, there should be no rigidity in its administration, and either a declaration or a subscription should be accepted as a working compromise.

Unfortunately this proposal to devise a declaration or subscription was not developed. Instead, the attention of the negotiating bodies was directed to the formulating of a condensed creedal statement, which, however, grew with the years until it became a document of considerable length, containing nineteen articles. In the light of experience it has become clear that this procedure was a blunder, and that a simpler and better solution might have been found by proceeding along the lines of the Declaratory Statement of the Presbyterians, which afforded liberty, while, at the same time, affirming the succession of the modern church to the historic faith of our fathers. Why should not a statement be framed which would cover not only the Westminster Confession of Faith, but all the great Reformation and post-Reformation symbols? Such a statement would afford relief from forms of expression no longer suited to the mind of the church and, at the same time, be a positive affirmation of the historic faith of Christendom. What is meant by this will become clearer by an examination of the Declaratory Statement of the Presbyterians.

It is probable that, when this Statement was prepared, the intention of those who framed it simply was to afford liberty in regard to subscription to extreme statements in the Confession of Faith, particularly those referring to election. In its actual effect, however, it did more. Of necessity all creedal formulas are constructed upon a certain number of basic positions, and the detailed statements of doctrine in sub-sections of the symbol follow by logical necessity from these basic positions. Consequently, permission to interpret any creedal symbol in a liberal way, and even to excise portions of it, involves destruction of the creed as an authoritative whole. The procedure may

be compared with the taking of sections from the walls and foundations of a house. The building may still remain standing, but it is a very unsafe structure, and it is very different from the home it formerly was.

Realizing this fact, though probably not following out its implications to the full, Presbyterians had inserted in their Declaratory Statement, affording relief from the rigour of the Westminster Confession, a summary of a few positions which the church considered vital to its faith, and which might not be abrogated by any declaration. These positions were briefly summarized in the statement that the doctrine of redemption involved belief in "the love of God to all mankind, his gift of his Son to be the propitiation for the sins of the whole world, and the free offer of salvation to men, without distinction, on the ground of Christ's all-sufficient sacrifice." In accordance with this ministers were expected to give "a chief place" in their teaching to the Incarnation, the atoning life and death, the Resurrection and Ascension, and the consequent bestowment of the Holy Spirit. No other requirements than these were involved in subscription to the "Confession of Faith as read in the light of the Declaratory Statement," although the church reserved to itself the right to guard against misuse of the liberty granted. Moreover, in practice, the liberty was even greater than the written statement declared, for, although redemption and atonement were emphasized as of the essence of the Christian faith, the Assembly did not formulate, nor did it demand acceptance of, any specific doctrine of atonement.

Seeing that liberty was thus granted, and that of necessity the Declaratory Statement destroyed the Westminster Confession of Faith as an authoritative exposition of the belief of the Presbyterian Church, the question not unnaturally arises why any reference to that historic document should be made at all. Would it not be better to formulate the few simple affirmations of the Declaratory Statement into a short creed and dispense with all reference to the past? The reasoning seems valid, but, in point of fact, it is open to serious objection, and the state-

ment of this objection is of the first importance in considering the relation of creed to church union. The first objection is the practical one that it is very doubtful if any entirely modern formula could be devised which would be acceptable to an Assembly and, at the same time, provide the liberty desired. This same objection would hold good of other church courts than the Presbyterian Assembly. But, even if such a formula could be devised, it would have the effect of destroying the sense of unity with the past which the Declaratory Statement affords.

It is no small thing to realize and affirm that the faith of the Church to-day is in its essence the faith of our fathers living still. If the creedal symbols of the past are inadequate for modern needs, the reason is not that the historic faith of the Christian Church is dead, but that our vision of the truth involved in that faith differs in many respects from the vision of men in Reformation and post-Reformation times. In other words, with truth there can be nothing fundamentally new, but the statement of truth, as the men of one age see it, cannot suffice for the men of a new age. It is, therefore, the right and duty of each succeeding generation to state its belief in its own way, while, at the same time, affirming that it still holds fast to the faith of the fathers. If a new generation decides that the time is not fitting for the formulation of a new symbol, it is a perfectly honourable and straight-forward thing to devise a declaratory statement affirming adherence to the essential faith of the past and stating the limits within which liberty is allowed. Moreover, it would be a relatively easy thing for each denomination to extend its declaration to cover the creedal symbols of other denominations. All that is required is a clear recognition of the fact that, just as the ever energizing creative spirit of Christ has, in the course of history, called into being various church organizations, with more or less defined forms of worship and discipline, so it has led men in every age to express the truth they have realized in their souls in the outward form of creedal symbols. These symbols do not possess

permanent authority as exact and final statements of truth; their value is relative, being limited by the point of view and conceptions of their own age. Yet the spirit of truth, which leads us to recognize this relative value, is the same spirit as led our fathers to formulate their beliefs. Realization of this inner unity is of the first importance for churches negotiating for union. Does it not prepare the way for mutual recognition of each other's formulas, and does it not make manifest that the theological divergences of days gone by have been resolved by a higher synthesis?

In view of these facts, it was distinctly unfortunate that the committees negotiating for union on behalf of the Congregational, Methodist, and Presbyterian Churches in Australia should have departed from the idea of a unifying formula in favour of drawing up what at best could be described as a conglomerate creed. As an initial step, the Presbyterians formulated nine short statements generally descriptive of their belief, not as a declaration of faith, but as a basis for discussion. It is interesting to note that opinion at this stage was divided. The union committee in the state of Victoria leaned to the idea of a very brief formula which would simply affirm belief in God through Jesus Christ, but to this the committee in the state of New South Wales would not agree. It was, therefore, resolved, instead, to devise a creedal statement which would "exhibit" the common belief of the contracting churches. As years went by, this "exhibition" creed became elaborated, in response to demands and objections, into a lengthy document. Moreover, the committees found that, instead of criticism being allayed by this elaboration, it became more and more pronounced. The dissatisfaction was greatest among the Presbyterians, who simply poured in amendments. At the time when the union vote was taken in state assemblies, there were upwards of one hundred and fifty amendments before the committee. Many of them were verbal and of little ultimate consequence, but others showed that the creedal statement put forward, as part of the basis of union, had failed entirely to meet the ends for which

it was framed. What would have happened to these amendments it is impossible to say; the adverse vote in three state assemblies brought negotiations to a sudden end and made further discussion useless for the time.

In the light of this experience, it is clearly advisable to proceed along different lines in regard to creed, when negotiations for union are renewed, as, in course of time, they inevitably must be. Two avenues only appear open. One is to attempt to formulate a very brief statement of faith, which will be broad enough to allow liberty of thought and definite enough to ensure that this does not mean the giving up of the essential positions of Christianity. The aim is one which commends itself strongly, but it is open to question whether it can be achieved. For one thing, it is exceedingly difficult to secure definiteness in a short statement. Most, if not all, statements suggested hitherto have been open to the charge of vagueness; indeed, it is probably this element of vagueness which has commended them to many, for vagueness of statement is one way of securing liberty of thought. If vagueness is to be avoided, there must be exact definition of terms, and this will immediately arouse conflict.

It is becoming increasingly clear that the living Church is the only right judge of what is essential to the Christian faith, and that all creedal formulas must be regarded as nothing more than statements of belief expressing truth as it is conceived by the Church at a particular time. As authoritative symbols, they can only be regarded, therefore, as possessing relative value, and yet each of them is the outward embodiment of a living faith. These considerations suggest that the best solution for the problem of creed, in its relation to church union, lies along the line of devising a Declaratory Statement similar in effect to that adopted by Presbyterians in Australia. It is interesting, when reviewing the union movement in Australia, to note that the committee dealing with creed made a movement in this direction in their preamble to the statement of doctrine. This preamble contained the following declaration:

We affirm our belief in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the primary source and ultimate standard of Christian faith and life. We maintain our allegiance to the evangelical doctrines of the Reformation as set forth in common in the doctrinal standards adopted or held by the Presbyterian Church, by the Congregational churches, and by the Methodist Church.

It is difficult to understand why, after adopting this statement, the committee thought it necessary to formulate what was, in effect, a condensed creed with nineteen articles. It was apparently not intended that every article in this creed should have binding authority on those who subscribed to it, since it was an "exhibition" creed; what, then, was the real value of formulating it at all? The essential thing for church union is that each of the negotiating bodies should be persuaded that the other churches with which it proposes to unite are true to the Christian faith and that their creedal statements, like its own, embody the essence of that faith. Any person who can see his way to accept the doctrinal position of any one of these churches meets the doctrinal requirements of the united church. All that is really necessary is to state this.

In conclusion, it seems apparent that, since any attempt to formulate either a detailed doctrinal formula or an exceedingly brief one, such as Dr. Denney suggested, is likely to lead to disruption in one or more of the churches contemplating union, some other method must be followed. Possibly no union will ever be accomplished which will not leave a few congregations outside, but Australia, at least, is not prepared to go on with a scheme of union which will split any one of the negotiating bodies in twain. It would undoubtedly simplify the difficulties connected with doctrine if a formula could be devised which recognized the doctrinal positions of each of the parties to union as of equal validity. For this purpose the affirmation in the preamble to the Australian statement of doctrine might suffice. In the opinion of the writer, it might be advisable to say no more, since an affirmation of this kind conserves all the liberties granted by individual denominations, while, at the same time, preserving all common safeguards. If, however, more than this

is demanded, it would seem best to throw it into the form of a Declaratory Statement, leaving the task of formulating a new creed to the united church. This Declaratory Statement would consist of a series of affirmations setting forth what is regarded as essential in the creedal formulas of the uniting churches. If the basis of union adopted by the Presbyterian churches of Australia may serve as a pattern, the doctrinal basis of a larger union might be stated somewhat as follows:—

1. The supreme standard of the united church shall be the Word of God contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments.

2. The subordinate standards of the united church shall be the doctrinal standards adopted or held by . . . . (here follow the names of the uniting churches) read in the light of the following Declaratory Statement:

(*a*) That the ever energizing Spirit of God has in the past not only created different church organizations, but has from time to time, led these organizations to express their faith by means of creedal symbols. These symbols contain the historic faith delivered to the Church by our Lord through his apostles, and this faith we hold to be of permanent authority, though the form of statement may vary and may be modified or changed by the Church in succeeding ages.

(*b*) That the love of God to all mankind, the atoning life and death of our Lord, his resurrection, the bestowal of the Holy Spirit, and the offer of salvation through Christ are regarded as vital doctrines for our Christian faith.

(*c*) That liberty of opinion is allowed on matters in the subordinate standards not essential to the Christian faith, the Church guarding against misuse of this liberty to the injury of its unity and peace.

A Declaratory Statement such as this may not appeal to all, but it has the practical advantage of avoiding unprofitable debate on questions of belief, while allowing each church to maintain its creedal relationship with the past; at the same time, it affirms the continuity of faith through the ages and resolves the doctrinal disputes of the past by bringing them into a larger unity. Finally, it leaves to the united church the opportunity of expressing the living faith which actuates it in terms suited to our modern age.

ANDREW R. OSBORN.

"UNA SANCTA"

BY J. G. TASKER, D.D.
Ex-President of the Wesleyan-Methodist Conference, Leamington, England

"If modern Protestantism is dominated too much by the negative principle of opposition to Rome, on the other hand, modern Catholicism also wastes precious energies in unfruitful negation and polemics, in its anti-Protestantism protesting too much"—in these words and in others like unto them Dr. Alfred von Martin, of Munich, explains the *raison d'etre* of the new Quarterly* of which he is the able editor. As it enters upon its third year, its promoters appeal to a wider constituency, and undoubtedly its study will amply repay all who share the editor's opinion that belief in the *Una Sancta* implies a determination to pray and to work for the realization of the ideal.

Una Sancta is avowedly the organ of the *Hochkirchlich-Œcumenischen Bundes,* but it rejoices to discover, alike in Catholic and Evangelical circles, "a disposition to draw nearer, notwithstanding the barriers of Confessions . . . A longing for unity is manifest in the Christianity of to-day." The common enemy of all the churches is "party-spirit, which is essentially Pharisaic pride, and, consequently, a snare of the great adversary of Christ." It is recognized that the consummation of these hopes is still remote, but they are held not to be Utopian; what is needed is a mutual understanding amongst those who ought to be allies in the conflict against social sins and social misery. True to these principles, the editor has included in the list of contributors "Roman Catholics and Greek Catholics, Anglicans and Old Catholics, Reformed and Lutheran." The Stockholm Conference is regarded as a "symbol of unity in the love of Christ," assuming, however, that "love without faith

* *Una Sancta: Ein Ruf an die Christenheit.* Vierteljahrsschrift herausgegeben von Alfred von Martin. 2. Jahrgang, 1926. Erstes Heft. M. 3. Stuttgart: Fr. Frommann.

would no longer be Christian love," and that, on the other hand, "faith without love would be a lifeless dogma, — an empty sound or an idol."

The sub-title of Professor Hans Ehrenberger's article on *The Œcumenical Idea* is "An Echo of Stockholm." In a volume published in 1920 the Roman Catholic, the Greek Catholic, and the Protestant churches were recognized by the author as being, in spite of their differences, "equally members of the mystical body of the *Una Sancta.*" Rome excluded herself from Stockholm, but Protestants had Christian fellowship with representatives of the Eastern Church. Dr. Ehrenberger regrets that there was not a more definite manifestation of the œcumenical spirit by German Protestants, and that, speaking generally, there was too great insistence upon the things that divide churches and nations. This judgment will not be universally approved, but all will agree that "whilst there are fences between the different sections of the vineyard, all the sections are included in the one vineyard." The Stockholm saying—"From the East *Lux,* from the West *Lex,*"—is quoted with approval, and the comment upon it is: "We Mid- and North-Europeans live between the East of *Lux* and the West of *Lex* in order that we may mediate between them."

The situation of the churches to-day is felicitously described as a series of three concentric circles: "the innermost circle is the Community of *Faith;* it consists of individual believers and bearers of the Cross. The middle circle is the Society of *Love,* of which the nuclei are little believing communities wherein seekers, doubters, and those who have erred are cared for in sympathetic love. The outermost circle is the Church of *Hope*—the œcumenical circle formed from groups of societies which we call separate churches, though they are all planted in the one vineyard."

Professor Friedrich Heiler of Marburg—the author of an important and widely-read work on *Evangelical Catholicism*—contributed to the January 1926 issue of *Una Sancta* an erudite and comprehensive article on *Evangelisches Hochkirchentum,* which article, it is hoped, will be translated into English.

A leading liberal theologian is quoted as having said before the War: "The Church is for us Protestants something subordinate *(nebensächliches).*" Dr. Heiler thinks that there is considerable truth in this dictum: "The one-sided emphasis on the *ecclesia invisibilis* has gradually led to the too frequent placing in the background of the idea of the Church. Together with this depreciation of the Church there has been a disuse *(Beseiting)* of that name of honour 'Catholic.'" It is pointed out that the Reformers, including those among them who were scholastics, did, as a matter of course, describe the Church of Christ as Catholic. Even Johann Gerhard unhesitatingly entitled his Apology for Evangelical Christianity a *Confessio Catholica.* By many, however, the use of this "glorious word" has been surrendered; "it has been handed over to the Romish Church, which gladly appropriated it."

Professor Heiler proceeds, in the development of his theme, to show how "the visible section of the Church is inseparably linked with the invisible. In this world we cannot have fellowship with the *ecclesia invisibilis* if we turn our backs upon the *ecclesia visibilis.*" Augustine answered his own question—"Where is the Body of Christ?"—by saying "Extend thy love over the whole world, if thou wouldest love Christ; for his members are to be found all over the earth." The Catholic idea of the Church implies that to be a child of the Church is "to have brotherly fellowship with all who belong to it—*communicare orbi terrarum.*"

Only a brief reference to a few of the remaining articles in a single number of the *Una Sancta* is possible, but even that will suffice to indicate the variety of its contents. Dr. George Boss of Nuremberg writes on *Will and Way,* denouncing the modern lie that every man is ultimately responsible for himself alone. The exact opposite is the truth. No man has a right to call himself either a Catholic or an Evangelical who forgets his responsibility for his fellow-man. Each word has an altruistic, even a universal, connotation. "He who does not recognize that outside his own Confession there are believers, but labels them as heterodox, lacks the mind of Christ, the Saviour of the

world. The boundary line which divides the visible-invisible Kingdom of Christ from the kingdom of the world is not drawn between believers and those who believe otherwise *(andersgläubige),* but between believers and unbelievers."

Some of the contributors deal indirectly with the central theme of *Una Sancta.* For example, Professor Steffes of Nihmwegen, Holland, examines "The Christmas Message in the Light of the History of Religions," his contention being that, however great may be the differences between the various Christian Confessions, these distinctions lose their prominence at the great Christian festivals, especially at Christmas.

Dr. Franz Müller, in a discriminating appreciation of *German Catholicism,* thinks that, in many criticisms of Protestantism, there is present to the mind this *petitio principii:* "It is an evil, because it hails from Luther." Attention is called to a striking article in the *Allgemeiner Rundschau* (1925, No. 36) by a convert, Dr. Albani, who asks Catholics "to study the problem of Luther *sub specie æternitatis.*" With one sentence Dr. Müller expresses complete agreement: "It is quite absurd to dispose of movements toward unity in a few words because they do not altogether comply with Catholic views. Let us confidently leave honourable men to continue their endeavours. We must trust something to the innate power of truth."

J. G. Tasker.

DISCLOSURE

When I consider how great wrong is foiled,
  How gross injustice totters to defeat,
How guile succumbs, how cunning is despoiled,
  How falsity stalks naked through the street,
I smile to see the Master, meek and mild,
Unfold God's Kingdom through a little child.

—*Charles R. Wakeley.*

REQUIREMENTS FOR REUNION*

BY FRANCIS J. HALL, D.D.
Professor of Dogmatic Theology in General Theological Seminary, New York

SOME of the most difficult questions of Faith and Order, requiring settlement before real and abiding unity can be achieved, have not been faced. I now aim to describe the requirements of reunion somewhat comprehensively, and very frankly, even in matters most difficult to discuss patiently. I write from the Anglican point of view; and, because adequate understanding thereof is needed in rightly estimating the situation, I devote some attention to its exposition. In the interests of clarity I shall have to venture statements that may tax the patience of Protestant readers. I trust, however, that they will perceive and approve of my purpose, that they will find no unfriendly language, and that they will patiently reckon with the points here given in the interest of more adequate study of the problem of unity. I am not ventilating personal views. *I seek to lay bare the situation, and to bring out the largeness of the problem.*

I assume: (*a*) that nothing short of the corporate union of all Christian communions in one body fully agrees with the mind of Christ; (*b*) that all smaller reunions, and all schemes and arrangements leading thereto, should be consistent with progress toward this goal; (*c*) that no schematic action should be taken which is likely to create new obstacles to the final reunion of Christendom. A really fresh and co-operative study of certain principles of Faith and Order embodied in the historic Catholic system is needed. And in this Protestants should reopen the question whether, *in their proper nature,* these principles are to be identified with, or necessarily involve, certain corrupt conceptions and practices rightly rejected in the sixteenth century.

* This article appears simultaneously in *The Anglican Theological Review.*

I. Anglican Standpoint

I think I have a substantially correct understanding of the Anglican standpoint; but I have available the very weighty exposition of it, entitled *Anglicanism,* by Dr. W. H. Carnegie, Sub-Dean of Westminster, published last year. It should be studied by all who would understand the deeper factors that make Anglicanism what it is—fundamentally the same since the English Church was organized in the seventh century.

Dr. Carnegie shows convincingly that "Institutional continuity, on its outer side, intense traditionalism, on its inner,—these are the master features of English life in all its chief aspects and activities." "The Anglican Church has maintained its institutional continuity by virtue of its strong traditionalism, by virtue of the instinctive reverence with which its members have all along been disposed to regard the teachings of past experience." This, it seems to me, explains Anglican opportunism, the readiness to be influenced by new movements without pursuing them radically to their logical end. Each succeeding convulsion has left Anglicanism "modified, it may be, in form, and enriched in content, but unaltered in essential character and direction." The papal factor, the Calvinistic influence, Latitudinarianism and Sentimentalism, Romanticism, Scientific Materialism, Biblical Criticism, Agnosticism and Industrialism, as Dr. Carnegie shows, have severally illustrated this.

Romanticism or Tractarianism, unlike the other influences mentioned, as Dr. Carnegie says, "revived the historical consciousness of the Anglican Church, and that consciousness once roused became a dominating factor in her activities." "Tractarianism restored Anglican Traditionalism to clear self-consciousness and provided it with effective means of luminous self-expression. Hence came its widespread influence. This has extended far beyond the circle of its declared adherents, and has become a factor which has to be taken into serious account in any estimate of contemporary church life." I add, also, in estimating what Anglicans in general will ultimately think and

do in relation to reunion. Dr. Carnegie proceeds to say that "the great majority of instructed and intelligent Churchmen of the present day, whatever their professed affinities or antagonisms, start from Tractarian assumptions, and accept Tractarian ideals, and approach the consideration of the religious problem from the Tractarian standpoint."

"In practice, if not in theory," he says, "the great majority of earnest Churchmen nowadays are Sacramentalists, and their sacramentalism is one of the signs and outcomes of their traditional consciousness, reawakened by Tractarianism." "The prevalent conception of the Christian life is that of a continuous growth, mediated and maintained by inter-connected sacramental ordinances. Low Churchmen may differ from High Churchmen, Evangelicals from Catholics, in their doctrinal expositions of the manner in which the Holy Spirit acts through these. But the ordinances themselves they set great store by, and use them as the main medium and implement of their pastoral activities."

So far Dr. Carnegie proceeds, with argument not safely to be disregarded by Nonconformists, in estimating the present trend of thought and practice among Anglicans. And this trend is no interruptive and non-significant phenomenon, but is a quickening of the deepest and most abiding undercurrent of Anglican developments from the beginning.

It is not difficult to show that Anglican sacramentalism reflects faithfully the official and constitutional position of the Anglican churches. And this affords evidence that the tradition which has kept the Anglicans faithful to the past—a past reaching far beyond the Reformation—is the Catholic tradition. The Reformation resulted in putting a soft pedal upon certain Catholic notes among Anglicans. But no real breach of continuity occurred, whether hierarchical, liturgical, or sacramental. Accordingly, when reactionary sentiments had grown less violent, and Anglicans began slowly to find themselves again, it was the ancient Catholic working system, retained in fundamentals in the Prayer Book, that mainly determined subsequent developments. Each revival of devotion to the pre-

scribed ways of the Prayer Book has resulted in a Catholic movement. And each movement of this kind, Laudian, Restorationist, and Tractarian, has brought into clearer light the outstanding fact that officially, and in prescribed working system, the English Church and her daughter churches belong to the Catholic group of churches. And the liberties which Anglicans, in general, cherish are Catholic liberties.

The Anglo-Catholic movement is a continuation of the Tractarian movement. Although more advanced in surface particulars, and attended, in some quarters, by incidental developments not widely approved, its fundamental sacramentalism is being increasingly emphasized, even among those who refuse any affiliation with the Anglo-Catholic *party*. And this is due to the fact that the Prayer Book is clearly patent of sacramentalist interpretation, to an important degree requires it. In brief, Anglo-Catholicism, in its fundamentals at least, is at home in the Anglican churches. It does not have to be tolerated, since it represents a recovery of the most abiding and most determinative Anglican tradition.

I am taking a large part of my space in exhibiting the Catholic nature of the Anglican position because its nonrealization by Nonconformists has hindered them from perceiving the representative aspect of Anglo-Catholic resistance to schemes for mutual ministerial recognition, occasional open communion, and so forth. This resistance, although most vocal among Anglo-Catholics, is approved by a controlling proportion of Anglicans.

Reminding my readers of the world-wide, ecumenical aim of the Anglican movement for reunion, I venture to maintain that, *if Nonconformists seriously seek to unite with Anglicans in this movement, they have need carefully to reckon with, and therefore adequately to understand, the Anglo-Catholic position.* It has representative value to a peculiarly significant degree; and its importance for the problem of reunion does not at all lie in the number of those who adhere to the Anglo-Catholic party, or approve of all of its incidental developments.

(*a*) In fundamental substance its leading contentions simply freshen and bring into sharp relief the sacramentalism which, as Dr. Carnegie shows, is traditionally implicit in Anglicanism.

(*b*) This sacramentalism, although often softened in expression, is retained in its most vital particulars in the Prayer Book. It is, therefore, an integral element of the official mind of the Anglican communion.

(*c*) Although Rome denies the place of Anglo-Catholics in the Church, and the Orthodox Easterns are not fully satisfied that they truly represent Anglicanism, their several positive principles plainly are, and from ancient times have been, maintained by seven-tenths of Christendom, as being integral parts of Christianity from the beginning.

In the light of all this, it is not difficult to perceive why every scheme for action looking to reunion between Nonconformists and Anglicans, even when advocated by prominent Anglican leaders, is defeated by Anglican inertia. The reason is that the majority of thoughtful Anglicans believe these schemes to be premature until certain vital questions are settled which have not as yet been seriously faced. And they cannot be faced adequately so long as Anglo-Catholicism itself is dismissed from examination as being an anomalous and non-representative factor in the situation. These considerations should not be taken as justifying abandonment of the present movement for reunion. God forbid! They simply bring into clear relief the contention that the work now before us all, in particular as between Nonconformists and Anglicans, is mutually educational. And our conferences should not be embarrassed by forcing the pace with schematic proposals. Questions of Faith and Order should receive our undistracted attention and study, study controlled by very patient mutual love and forbearance.

II. Requirements of Unity in General

By "requirements" I do not here means "terms," or specific proposals, the acceptance of which will be required on the

Catholic side as a formal basis of reunion. I doubt the possibility of accurately anticipating what terms in this sense will ultimately be stipulated in reunion either between Catholics and Nonconformist bodies or between bodies within one of these groups. I am seeking rather to define in a general way the leading principles of Faith and Order that are retained by Catholic churches as integral to historic Christianity, and are considered necessary to be securely safeguarded in the reunited universal Church. It is quite possible that, when the conditions for ecumenical reunion have sufficiently developed for final action, a common mind and purpose will have emerged that will very materially reduce the formidableness of the "terms" exacted by the several parties to such reunion. I am seeking to summarize the principles of Faith and Order which are regarded by the larger section of Christendom as integral to Christianity. And they are maintained with varying degrees of articulate definition and emphasis by a body of Anglicans sufficiently influential and sufficiently fortified by ecclesiastical formularies and prescriptions to determine how far the Anglican communion can go in the interest of reunion with Nonconformists.

Two significant Anglican pronouncements will serve as convenient introduction.

1. The first Lambeth Conference declared, "We . . . . do hereby solemnly record our conviction that unity will be most effectually promoted by maintaining the Faith in its purity and integrity, as taught in the Holy Scriptures, held by the primitive Church, summed up in the creeds, and affirmed by the undisputed general councils."

2. The American House of Bishops, in the main part of its Declaration on Unity, widely and misleadingly ignored in interpreting the "Quadrilateral" appennded thereto, says, "We do hereby affirm that the Christian unity now so earnestly desired . . . . can be restored only by the return of all Christian communions to the principles of unity exemplified by the undivided Catholic Church during the first ages of its existence; which principles we believe to be the substantial deposit of

Christian Faith and Order committed by Christ and his apostles to the Church unto the end of the world, and, therefore, incapable of compromise or surrender by those who have been ordained to be its stewards and trustees for the common and equal benefit of all men." The four articles of the "Quadrilateral" appended as examples of what was meant, including "the Historic Episcopate," were explicitly described "as inherent parts of this sacred deposit." The contention that the Historic Episcopate was included merely as an ancient fact, without any particular view of its origin, is, therefore, plainly mistaken, although the bishops did declare the need of its being "locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of his Church."

My general thesis is that, among the questions of Faith and Order that have to be faced and patiently studied by all who labour for world-wide reunion, the leading ones are raised by the belief of a vast majority of Christendom that the ancient Catholic system—I do not mean anything peculiarly Roman—comes from Christ, and, therefore, is the only available basis of complete and permanent Christian unity.

I would here remark that this is not a personal theory, but an obvious situation—one that cannot be disregarded in really intelligent work for unity. The particular requirements that I am to indicate may seem to be distinctively Anglo-Catholic, but their practical urgency in the reunion problem lies in their having had many centuries of general consent and in their still retaining the consent of seven-tenths of Christendom. Protestants surely ought to reckon with this fact, and, therefore, not hastily to decline the task of investigating freshly and patiently the questions involved.

III. Intrinsic Requirements

The requirements of ecumenical union may be classified in two groups; (1) those that are involved in a general restoration of the Faith and Order permanently committed to the Church

by Christ and his apostles, purified, of course, of all corrupting accretions; (2) those that pertain to securing and maintaining in the reunited Church *such degree* of mutual conformity in other matters as will be needed if a common spiritual atmosphere and mutual understanding are to be preserved. In brief, the requirements are partly intrinsic and partly extrinsic—the former not admitting of compromise, the latter susceptible of modification by common consent and of elastic adjustment in *details* to times, places, and conditions. In this section I seek to indicate the more fundamental, intrinsic, requirements, as Oriental, Roman, and Anglican Catholics alike regard them.

(*a*) Practical acceptance of the whole historic Faith, as taught by the ancient Catholic Church, as partly defined in the Catholic creeds, and as confirmed by the Scriptures. This requires that the supernatural shall not be explained away, and that the Catholic creeds shall not be so interpreted as to subvert their historic meaning. On the other hand, it leaves Christians free either to accept or reject theological and popular opinions not probably involved in the Faith, and fearlessly to welcome all additions to knowledge gained by human inquiry. However, such knowledge ought not to be understood to enlarge or alter, in substance, the doctrines once for all revealed for guidance into eternal life, but simply to enrich the intelligence with which we receive, defend, and apply them.

(*b*) The teaching authority of the universal Church should be acknowledged. This does not mean that mental freedom and private judgment should be abandoned. A faith that does not represent personal persuasion is defective. It means that, in the exercise of such freedom men are to reckon with Christ's commission to his Church and his promise that it should be guided by the Holy Spirit. Putting aside contentious infallibilist terms, this commission should be recognized as making the Faith of the universal Church quite the most weighty, authoritative, and dependable definition to Christian believers of *saving doctrine* that can be had on earth. The fact that those who treat the Scriptures as the *sole* rule of faith are not led thereby to adequate consent in doctrine, and the contrasted fact

that those who accept the Church's teaching authority are agreed much more comprehensively therein, and so agreed in spite of centuries of schism between Catholic bodies, these facts should suggest to Protestants a fresh consideration of the whole subject. And it should be remembered that the teaching authority of the Church does not, in Catholic judgment, do away with the necessity that church doctrine should stand the test of confirmation by Scriptures.

(*c*) The ancient Sacramentalism of the Church should be accepted both doctrinally and practically as a vital element of the Christian system. An increasing number of critical scholars find it in St. Paul's Epistles, and the attempt to prove that in this St. Paul departed from Christ is futile. It needs to be agreed for reunion that the sacraments are appointed instruments of supernatural operations of the Holy Spirit. They are not *beneficial* except under moral conditions, certainly not to the unbelieving and impenitent; but their objective efficiency, as means of grace, is due to the pledged, specific, and supernatural operation in them of the Holy Spirit—not to our faith. The primary sacraments, of course, are Baptism and the Holy Communion, but if we are to use the term sacrament in the traditional sense of any appointed means of sanctifying grace, the sacramental requirements of unity cannot be restricted to these two. The laying on of hands, or Confirmation, is plainly treated in the New Testament as the prescribed means by which the gifts of the Holy Spirit are bestowed upon the baptized. The sacrament of Penance is simply the generally appointed method by which the ministers of Christ exercise the authority which He gave them of remitting sins in his Name. Ordination in the New Testament is clearly treated as imparting the Holy Spirit for the work of the ministry. The Catholic Church cannot, without betrayal of trust, permit these things to be treated as admitting of compromise in the interests of unity.

Moreover, Catholics will insist that Baptism be regarded as the appointed means of admission to the Church, of incorporation into Christ's Body, and, consequently, of participation in the supernatural sonship of Christ. This last is the meaning

of baptismal regeneration as maintained by Catholics. If they used the term regeneration to signify personal conversion, they would, of course, admit that infants are not regenerate in Baptism.

Finally, although considerable theological liberty and provincial variation can be discovered in Catholic views of the Holy Communion, and such liberty will surely remain in the reunited Catholic Church, certain requirements will, beyond doubt, be treated as not open to compromise: (*a*) that the consecrated species, in a mysterious, but not less real and vital sense, are the Body and Blood of Christ; (*b*) that, as the appointed memorial before God of Christ's death, and the means whereby we plead its merits and in union with Christ formally and corporately offer ourselves to God, it is sacrificial; (*c*) that, as in New Testament days, it should be the central act of Christian worship, on every Lord's Day at least, with such regular frequency of communion by individuals as their spiritual states permit.

The ancient threefold ministry of bishops, priests, and deacons will have to be recognized in the reunited Church, and Catholic doctrine will not permit its permanence to be made uncertain by its authority being based upon mere human compact. To the Catholic mind it represents Orders that have been appointed by the Holy Spirit, and that depend, for their assured continuance, upon unbroken succession by means of episcopal ordination. The difficulty of Protestant scholars in accepting this conviction seems largely to be due to their not reckoning adequately with certain outstanding and determinative facts, and to their absorption in the apparently impossible task of clearly tracing the ministerial developments of the obscure period of, say, seventy-five years after St. Paul's death.

The outstanding established facts are — (*a*) that Christ established the apostolate as the beginning of the ministry with which He promised to abide until the end of the world; (*b*) that while this ministry was reinforced for the emergencies of the creative period by prophets especially raised up, for the normal ordering of the Mother Church of Jerusalem the apos-

tolic ministry was differentiated into three Orders—James, the presbyters and the deacons; (*c*) that when the sub-apostolic Church emerges into clear historical light, this three-fold ministry is found to be generally accepted as having divinely guided apostolic appointment—and this before the tradition of apostolic arrangements had had time to become unreliable in its main substance; (*d*) that during the intervening periods, the missionary churches were not given self-sufficient organization, their ministers having only the Orders of presbyters (also called bishops because charged with local oversight, and deacons; but that ordinations, so far as recorded, were performed by visiting ministers of higher rank, such as St. Paul, Timothy, and Titus. No exclusively presbyterial or congregational ordination has been proved to have occurred, or to have been treated as sufficient, in the primitive Church. To Catholic scholars these facts appear to determine the state of the question, and to show that *the broad stream of tradition ad rem. should be accepted until its falsity has been proved.* This surely has not been done. Such facts as have been alleged, neither numerous nor usually free from obscurity, appear susceptible of interpretation in harmony with the traditional doctrine.

In considering the Historic Episcopate, it should be remembered that the various abuses summed up in the word "prelacy," and rightly condemned by Protestants, do not inhere in episcopacy as such, but grew out of the secularization of the Church through its relation to the State and its resulting civil status and privilege. This abuse can and must be guarded against in the reunited Church.

(*e*) The perpetuation of the ministerial priesthood, always treated in Catholic doctrine as an essential element of the Christian system, is one of the leading reasons for insisting upon the episcopate. A lively memory of offensive sacerdotal abuses naturally makes it difficult for Protestants patiently to consider this subject afresh, and to realize that the most acute objections to sacerdotalism do not rightly apply to the Catholic doctrine of priesthood but to reformable abuses. None the less, the whole subject has to be faced, and patiently reckoned with, if world-wide Christian unity is to be attained.

I have space for only a few remarks on this troublesome subject. According to Catholic doctrine, ministerial priests constitute a distinct sacred Order in the Church, and their characteristic functions—e. g. in the Eucharist and in the ministry of reconciliation—cannot be validly performed except by those who have been admitted to the priestly Order by episcopal ordination. That mediæval abuses had deplorable effect is, of course, true. But that the *appointed* exercise of the sacerdotal functions, above referred to, involves an intervention between the individual soul and God, which deprives the laity of free access to Him, and trenches upon Christ's sole mediatorship, is not borne out by the normal experience of devout Catholics. Moreover, if, as Catholics believe, the ministerial priesthood is of Divine appointment, the remedy for its human abuses is not an abandonment of priesthood but their reformation.

Two lines of study, carefully pursued, ought to be helpful in clarifying the whole subject. The first is suggested by the Catholic doctrine, that the ministerial priesthood represents the manner in which Christ—*the real operator,* through his Spirit, in the sacraments—accommodates the earthly exercises of his mediatorial office to our conditions and limitations. The earthly priesthood is Christ's own hand, so to speak, extended to us. The second is the doctrine of the Church as the Body of Christ —an organism, and, therefore, possessed of organs through which the whole body operates. The organ—priest—is not external to the body, and cannot act apart from its other members. The relation between priest and people is interior, and the whole body shares, by *corporate participation,* in what the ministerial priest does *ministerially* and as organ of the body.

To conclude this section, however imperfect my expositions may be, it is certain that, in fundamental substance, the requirements here described are regarded throughout Catholic Christendom as integral elements of Christianity and insusceptible of material compromise. And this fact has to be reckoned with in every actual step toward reunion in which the Anglican communion can take part without internal disruption.

IV. Extrinsic Requirements

I come now to the requirements which pertain to effectiveness of the unity that we aim to establish. This unity involves not only the fundamentals of Faith and Order, but requires one universal and corporate fellowship in sacramental life and worship, recognizable by all participants and visible to the world. Nothing short of this can fulfil Christ's prayer for the oneness of his disciples and correspond to the teachings of St. Paul as seen in I Corinthians XII and Ephesians IV. This means, of course, schematic agreement as to the human arrangements by which, in the reunited Christendom, the balance between authority and freedom will be kept practically secure and all Christians will find themselves at home wherever in all the world they may travel. Being human, these arrangements will be subject to a considerable degree of adaptation to local conditions. None the less, if the common fellowship is effectively to be safeguarded, *there will have to be general conformity in certain obtrusively significant externals of corporate practice.* It would be premature to define them narrowly. I attempt only to indicate summarily and tentatively what appear to be their more obvious lines.

(*a*) If the Church is to be visibly one throughout the world, it would seem that no other distributions of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and governmental autonomy should be retained than are essential to effective local ordering of Christian interests. Whatever temporary recognition of denominational organizations may be necessary during the period of mutual assimilation in one body, the continuance of "churches" of obtrusively divergent methods of Christian regimen is not consistent with the effective common fellowship that is required. Particular needs may indeed continue to be cherished by unofficial societies, orders, or guilds; but for them to assume denominational standing, so as to differentiate Christians in corporate worship and discipline, is surely prejudicial to unity, since it must hinder the development of a common spiritual life.

(*b*) In the balance between conformity and freedom that will be needed, the requirements of general conformity will

naturally center in eucharistic worship and sacramental ministrations. The importance that has ever been attached to their safeguarding—to their visibly retaining forever their original appointed meaning and application—will preclude Catholic acceptance of doctrinally significant divergence in their ministration. The eucharistic liturgies of Catholic churches everywhere, varying as they do in many details, are sufficiently alike to be recognized as having a common norm and *meaning*. It will surely be required that this norm shall not be significantly violated in any part of the reunited Catholic Church, and that, as in primitive days, eucharistic worship shall be the central corporate function of at least every Lord's Day. This alone can provide the necessary rallying point of Christians in their corporate approach to God.

(*c*) On the other hand, outside the sacramental sphere there must be a *very* considerable degree of liberty, both in local adaptations of episcopal polity and in public services. That the principle of uniformity has been pushed too far in Anglican history is clearly evident. Outside the common eucharistic worship there should be explicit allowance of any diversity that is consistent with Christian principles and decent order. Prayer meetings, experience meetings, revivals, missions, retreats, quiet days, meditations, and all forms of congregational exercises that are found to be edifying, and are not conducted with divisive aim, should be freely conceded to the discretion of local pastors and congregations. None of these services—I include morning and evening prayer—should be so prescribed for all as to preclude deviation for common edification and to meet varying local, congregational, or missionary needs and exigencies. Conformity should not mean a uniformity prejudicial to decent liberty and spiritual enthusiams.

(*d*) Obviously these things cannot be ordered in Catholic unity without some ecumenical machinery. But what it ought to be I do not presume to assert. It may be a Holy Synod, the members of which are elected by the several parts of the Church; or it may be an effectually reformed and constitutionalized papal curia, safeguarded by a world-wide elective system

from any return to autocracy or to the dominance of Latinism. Perhaps something else will emerge. But without *some* central machinery Christendom cannot be held together in effective unity. Yet no such machinery should be exempt from control by the Church at large through ecumenical councils constitutionally provided for, perhaps at stated intervals, certainly under duly defined circumstances.

V. Conclusion

The reader may well wonder how a task beset with such formidable difficulties can ever be accomplished. I have no desire to minimize these difficulties. In fact, the aim of my paper throughout has been to show how great they are, and how necessary it is to engage in patient educational work before schematic steps can be taken that will not bring disillusionment. I believe that the movement for reunion is of God, upon whose help we need to depend and may count, and that we may not recoil from the task set before us. But, if we are to avoid blind alleys, *we must realize the situation in Christendom, and learn therefrom not to be impatient for quick action and quick results.* Much prayer for Divine help and guidance, much conference for better mutual understanding, and much fresh study of questions that have seemed to be settled for ourselves, these are now needed—not forgetting the need of patient continuance therein.

Two things have to be borne in mind. The first is that, while mutual understanding is an indispensable *preliminary* of advance to a common mind, it cannot *of itself* secure the needed agreement. Much study is required, and that humble openness of mind which comes only by Divine grace in response to prayer. *Very important changes of conviction are involved, even after mutual understanding has been reached.*

The second point is that the only line of agreement that can avail for abiding reunion of sincere Christians is *common acceptance of the Faith and Order that Christ has revealed and appointed. We think vainly if we suppose we can create or*

evolve any new Faith and Order for Christ's Church. As the American bishops said in 1886, we must return to "the principles of unity, exemplified by the undivided Catholic Church during the first ages of its existence"—to the things divinely given in the beginning. Nothing else can hold Christendom together, for these things constitute *historic Christianity.*

FRANCIS J. HALL.

THE CLIMBERS

The mountain climber sees the final goal
In each new crag which, looming sheer above,
Hides all beyond and seems to lift its brow
Into the farthest ether! yet when gained,
Proves but the promise of a larger view,
Until the last is scaled, and from the top
The lower peaks appear like giant steps
Upon a winding stair.

So in our lives,
Each ardent aspiration seems in turn
The ultimate; but, realized, affords
Faint visions of sublime ideals beyond.
The very heavens that the creeds bestow
Upon their followers, like illusive crags,
Are merely stations on the mighty Road,
Giving new courage for the steep ascent.

Thrice blessed are the ways of him who knows
Each heaven but a step upon the stair
That leads to perfect and unchanging bliss:
Union with God and with all other souls.
He can, by consecration to mankind
And full devotion to his Higher Self,
O'erleap all intervening steps to come
Into the presence of the Infinite.

—Dombey Shepherd.

THE CHURCH'S NEW MAJOR INTEREST

BY REV. CHARLES LLOYD GARRISON
Minister of the Northside Christian Church, Cincinnati, Ohio

MANY true prophets are with us still, and yet they are not crying aloud these days, not giving forth great and impassioned utterances. And there are many good and earnest preachers, men of true insight and vision, and some of them are distinguished intellectuals and well instructed in the technique of preaching, but the apathy and chill of the times is not conducive to great preaching. As with the spoken word so of the Christian literature of the day, we have polish and refinement in plenty, but less than we need of those indestructable fires and emotional releases which consume the impurities of times and condition progressive social movements.

Bewildering, paradoxical age in which the differently coloured waters of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries are strangely mixed! We have the seers and the spiritual visibility is good, yet is the seeing so often disappointing. It must be that the focalization is not right for the times. The Church has more machinery than ever she had and a vast army of executives, superintendents, foremen, engineers, mechanics, and stokers, but she cannot make up her mind what she ought to produce with it. The best intellects of the Church are busy here and there, but there is no common condition of mind correlating and synthesizing their energies, for there is no major interest to which the commonality of minds, both large and small, everywhere within the Church are vibrating. Many streams sparkle and sing amid the hills, and some of them are very sweet and refreshing, but they do not seem to collect in great rivers of blessing. Vast social areas are parched and spiritual famine is raging because the refreshing waters of the

headlands are not coming down in sufficient flow to irrigate the lowlands.

Christian leaders of the age of many minds and the people are confused. They do not know whom to follow or what to believe. The Church is wanting in objective, therefore she is poor in men of splendid intensities. Christianity is not failing, but the Church is rapidly losing her grip on the men of this age. Of course it is an unemotional time. Everybody realizes that. People are studiously suppressing their emotions. The people of these times act as if they were ashamed of being moved perceptibly by anything. They are literally starving and stifling their feelings, little realizing that, in so doing, they are casting away the better half of life's loaf. The man or the age that is rich in feelings, though poor in material things, yet has food and treasure in greatest abundance. The age that is rich in great lives and fruitful achievements is always an age in which the emotions of men and women are very strong.

But great emotions are contingent upon concrete objects that are great. To be moved in a certain way, for example, one must have made the acquaintance of a real mountain and communed with it when its great shoulders were clad in the gray mist of morning or adorned with purple brushed and edged with gold as the sun went down. To be moved in another way one must come under the spell of certain unforgettable lines written by a poet who possessed the Divine art of investing images with fire and beauty. To be moved in yet another way, one must see a strong and purposeful man preserving a certain high integrity in the midst of boundless corruptions or maintaining his faith in the goodness of the universe, although his own little world has caved in, leaving him unsheltered and forsaken amid its ruins. If an age is shallow in feeling it is fairly certain that there is little or nothing of that age capable of arousing deep emotions. As men think together they think profoundly, and it is only by the concentration of many high-powered, contemporaneous minds on single large interests that great periodic energies of feeling are developed and released.

Thoughtful non-churchmen would like to know why there is no major interest of twentieth century Christianity doing business for God and the world. Who or what is responsible for the tragic absence of such an interest? Can such an interest come by observation? The Church has now, as always, her working orders, to be sure. These great matters, all men understand perfectly well, constitute her primary business in every age. But labourers for each successive age are called forth and intrigued by some commanding and passionate urge that is current and authoritative for that particular time. Preaching and teaching everywhere and in all ages the Word—yes; but complementary motives and incentives must be supplied from age to age to keep up the morale of the workers.

Perhaps the most embarrassing comment a non-churchman could make upon the Church of our times is that she has failed to discover and agree upon a large and compelling interest. The unchurched masses of the world are waiting for the Church to bring something to pass that will be an objective and authentic sign for the times. Can she do it? Will she do it? The immense restiveness of people throughout the world—youth in particular—is our futile protest against a colourless and mechanical civilization. What has become of the poetry and passion, the charm and the sparkle of yesteryear? Youth wants to find something to live and die for. Has the Church anything of this sort to offer? Is the Church of our day equal to the task of releasing and flinging in amongst our youth a dominant interest upon which they may pounce now—to paraphrase a memorable saying of Cicero's—with full joyfulness of living and fairer hopes in their dying? Is it nothing to the Church that so many young lives of to-day are empty, aimless? What good thing would the Church have them do? They would like to be told.

Church history clearly shows that every large and fruitful era in the progress of Christianity down the centuries is due to the stimulative influence of some major interest. The periods which are dullest and most barren, which are suggestive of stagnation and futility rather than progress and purposefulness,

are the periods in which there was no such interest. The Church of every age requires a supreme motive or incentive whereby she must save her soul and justify herself to the people of that age. If she does not major in some interest that is big and arresting, something that sets the best minds of the Church aflame, something that appeals with irresistible power to the imagination of her youth, something that quickens the hearts and wins the approval of the people, then is she doomed to mark time for a season. Not having any big assignments the best brains of the Church are very likely either to rust out or to fritter time away on matters of little importance. There will always be in such periods a few brilliant essayists and a few excellent sermonizers. Theology, biography, criticism, and history will claim the attention of scholars, and in these literatures some contributions of permanent value may be expected. But the ears of that age do not hear epic interpretations of life and the eyes of that age do not see and rejoice in the perfections and finalities of prophetic utterance. Wanting are the kind of books that cause prisons to rock on their foundations and prison doors to open, and the kind of books that lift their readers up and transport them into new worlds do not appear. The universal mind of the Church is not moving forward agressively on a wide front, but is occupied in fortifying its position and consolidating its gains.

Major interests are bright and shining stars in the firmament of the ages. They are concrete and fixed. They seem to make for sanity and largeness of purpose. They clarify the thinking of men as electrical storms purify and sweeten the air. They are very stimulating. They start all the intermittent springs to running and they multiply the flow of all perennial fountains. They are both thought-situations and motivating forces. They gather up the intellectual activities of an age as the rivers collect the waters of a thousand lesser streams, and, having thus massed the thought of an age, they move majestically onward. They make men and determine movements. They are tremendously dynamic. They quicken the minds of all church leaders and they "put to silence the ignorance of foolish men."

The age without a major is simply out of luck. It may have no end of potentially great men, but they can hardly attain their best. Conditions are overwhelmingly against them. There is no great, passionate interest on the air. Nothing but silence, or static, which is worse than silence. Consequently perfectly splendid minds go along empty of big, purposeful, and masterful incentives. Before you criticize too severely the men of any time examine the thought-situation of the period and make sure they have not an alibi.

The major interest is concrete. It has to do with a definite objective. It calls for plans and programmes, yet these are but means to an end, and it is the end that is all-glorious. Something or other dimly seen at first has drawn centuries nearer. And its outlines have become sharp, its form has grown fairer than the day, and the jewels in its hand and the glories in its train have engaged the universal mind. To possess this new love the whole Church now advances, and her going forth is as the going of those who would meet the bridegroom.

Thus the major interest calls for action. Always and insistently it calls for people to be up and doing. There is a certain fine urgency of it. It will not, it cannot wait. Because of it orders issue quickly, mobilizing in all nations of the earth the forces of the Church. Now in the spirit and with understanding congregations may sing

"Like a mighty army moves the Church of God!"

She really is now *moving,* for she has found a cause. Thereby hearts are thrilled and champions and advocates are won by the hundreds of thousands and by the millions. There is a conflagration of all the combustible stuff in man. And it was the major interest that set it on fire.

The major interest appeals strongly to the imagination. It hints of romance and adventure, the magic and mystery of strange places, and the crash and glory of great conquests and memorable occasions; of fellowships and fountains and purple investitures where all the tedium and the drabness of the days is fallen away and the sons of men are come unto the Kingdom of radiant fulfilment. The major interest that is fully under

way is irresistible. It is the massed passion of an age. Like the great wind it may rise gradually, the first breath of it being but a gentle zephyr; yet it grows and accelerates and swells in volume, until presently it is playing on the emotions of an age as a strong wind fingers the mighty trees of the forest. Sometimes the major interest is as a torch applied to dry grass on a blustery day. Such was the crusade interest of the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries.

A major interest must be something new. The charm of novelty is absolutely essential. When a major has served its age that is the end of it. It cannot be revamped and used over again. That is the reason the cathedral-building emphasis of recent times fails to impress the modern mind. It is both imitative and anachronistic, therefore unworthy of the age. If twentieth century Christianity can do nothing better than to hark back to the Middle Ages for an out-moded major she had better wait till the Spirit moves her.

And the major interest must be big. Comprehensiveness, a vast inclusiveness it must always have, for the true major is for all the people. It must be utterly free from the slightest taint of favoritism. The spread of its passion and the proffer of its benefits must be as wide as the dispersion of the saints. It must appeal to the universal mind, it must quicken the universal heart of the Church. It must suggest a good both evident and greatly to be desired, a worth supremely worthful. It must be in itself a thing so estimable that nothing to be given in exchange for it would seem to be too costly. It must be a cause so pure and holy that a good man might gladly lay down his life if he could thereby hasten by a single hour its realization and triumph.

And the major interest must be costly. Richly it gives to, greatly it exacts of, the age. It may demand the pouring out of material treasure. The classic church-building interest of the Middle Ages revealed to the people of those times the joys of self-denial and taught them the grace of sacrificial giving. It may call for the pouring out of life on a grand scale, as did the Crusades. It may compel the expenditure of vast intellectual

energy, as did the definition and defense of doctrine from the second to the sixth century. And always the price of the major interest includes new orientations, fresh evaluations, and costly readjustments.

Thus the true major is always daring and difficult. It calls for men who love the frontiers and perils and all high places; and for men who keep the issue clear, though great controversies rage and the fierce lightnings of intolerance and hate split the heavens. Since the age-interest is a progressive spirit it must besiege the citadels of smug contentedness, and that always brings on tumult and stout opposition. Does anybody imagine for a moment that the achievement of religious freedom was a simple and easy matter? Was there ever anything on this earth more grandly difficult, more gloriously dangerous? The passion for religious freedom was the Church's splendid major from the fourteenth to the seventeenth century. And of all her majors up to the present time this is her classic.

The major interest is a thought-situation ordained and inevitable. It does not come by violence, it does not come by legislation, and the process of its coming cannot be forced. It comes because it is due. Men may gear in and go along with it, or they may stand aloof for a time and resolve to have no part or lot in it; but, in the end, the major prevails. While it cannot be forced, it may be hindered. Though thus delayed, it cannot be indefinitely held back by man or circumstance. All things that have gone before are forerunners of the new condition of mind, and all the things that follow are destined to be effected by the major.

In the final analysis the grand function of the major interest is to facilitate the propagation of the Gospel. To this end it has come unto the age. Either directly or indirectly it makes conditions better for the effective preaching and teaching of the Gospel and for promoting all charitable and cultural activities of the Church. It emphasizes and brings home to the minds of careless men within the Church and out of it the beauty and lastingness of the things of the spirit. It is as "the voice of one crying in the wilderness, make ye ready the way of the Lord."

If this brief study of the nature and function of what is here termed the commanding interest is correctly informed, then a major is indeed a thing greatly to be desired. Has the Church of our day anything at all answering the description of a true major? Is there anything in sight which meets satisfactorily the several conditions of a valid major church interest? The emphases of the Church are scattered amongst many things. Seemingly there is little thought, certainly there is no concurrence of opinion *apropos* the certain big thing which ought by rights, and may be made in time, to loom above all lesser interests. There is no adventurous questing on a grand scale, no spontaneous pyramiding of effort, no lavish outpouring of universal passion in the Church. The mission boards of the churches are busy collecting monies and sending out missionaries. And, of course, the Church must always do that, or she will develop spiritual anæmia. Benevolent enterprises are calling for funds and yet more funds; and, thanks to the rediscovery of the apostolic principle of Christian stewardship, these beautiful ministries are everywhere enlarging. And there is our latter-day interest in Christian education. Practically all of the communions of Christendom have, in recent years, been multiplying, enlarging, and improving their educational institutions and handsomely increasing their educational endowments. And the social implications of the Gospel have unfolded in a new way to not a few choice spirits of the Church, and there is an interest, objective, and passion in regard to these matters, which indicate a new trend and inspire great hopes. And many other more or less important interests of the Church are claiming scattered emphases. But the Church as a whole is not now vibrating to a single dominant passion.

And more or less consciously leading minds of the Church seem to be sensing the need of a new major interest. There is a casting about, a notion to experiment with this, or go tentatively into that. The Church does not seem to know precisely what she is looking for, but she keeps on looking. Some have even suggested a return, on the part of Protestant groups, to larger dependence upon ritual and symbolism—an extremely

doubtful, if not reactionary, expedient reminiscent of the activities of that group of brilliant scholars, of the early part of the nineteenth century, who inaugurated the Oxford Movement. Although the mind of the Church as a whole seems confused, her attention shifting quickly from one thing to another, her mood is manifestly expectant; for surely a new major is due to appear. Desperately it is needed. What will it be? Whence is it coming? When may it be expected? Earnest men of the Church and interested observers outside of the Church are waiting, wondering. Some of the faithful are longing and praying for the first tokens of its coming in the leaves of the mulberry tree. Leaders of statesmanlike calibre may plan advances for the Church, and devoted ministers of the Word may teach and persuade and carry on as best they can under the fearful handicaps which everybody with eyes must see, but the whole Church of Christ cannot move forward mightily, with exhilarance and abandon and passionate joy, until her dry bones are clothed again with flesh and blood. And nothing short of a great new interest—a genuine major—can perform that miracle.

The more closely the major interest articulates with the primary task of the Church, the more immediate and practical are its benefits. Of all the majors which the Church has had that of the Crusades seems to excel in romance and sheer costliness of life. The Crusaders did, indeed, bring back the Greek and Roman classics and a passion for learning and art, thus paving the way for the Renaissance, but from an evangelistic standpoint the immediate gains were negligible. Advocates of creeds believe that these historic utterances have many values and serve many purposes, among which they would include the evangelistic interest, explaining that it is in their missionary character. "These definitions are concerning a redeeming God, and for proclamation, that all men may be led to faith in Christ," Not to go here into the merits of the arguments for and against creeds, or those great articulations in forms and words of the Church's belief, would anybody nowadays recommend the creed-building interest as a preparatory training for missionaries?

We are desperately pragmatic. People of to-day want to see results just as quickly as substantial results may be had. This overeagerness is, in some ways, regrettable, but it is on us and it constitutes a feature of the thought-situation of the times. Therefore, we may expect the pre-eminent church interest of the near future to be one that will link up very closely with and help along very definitely all of those fundamental enterprises to which the Church is evermore committed; such as evangelism at home and abroad, Christian benevolences, Christian education, and various accedited forms of Christian service. These are essential concerns of the Church and any super-interest that might appear to hinder or to menace them would, and ought to be, resented. The major interest for the twentieth century must be a mothering interest which will love and nourish these precious wards of the Church.

The social Gospel, or more concisely, the wider applications of the social ideals and principles of Jesus, is a significant modern emphasis, especially when considered along with the Church's need of a new major interest. The narrowly individualistic conception and interpretation of Christianity does not fit the temper of the times. Christ had a social message for his day and for all the days. And the Church must develop a like social mind and heart. She cannot be true to her Divine Head and hesitate to preach fully and fearlessly the social Gospel. But how can she do it? In her present divided condition she is utterly incapable of such adventurous and perilous proclamation. And that gives us a clue to the new major interest that must arise and serve the age before the Kingdom of God can come in a large and redemptive way to the people of these times. Christian union is the major interest for twentieth century Christianity.

Does the Christian union interest meet the several tests of a true major? Does it satisfactorily fulfill all the conditions of such an interest? Let us see.

Christian union is a concrete interest. As an ideal it is sharply outlined, and passing fair. It proposes a definite goal —the restoration of the long-lost solidarity and brotherhood of

all true believers and the holy and catholic Church. It calls for conferences, conciliation, and tolerance; and it demands all there is in the whole Church of wisdom, patience, tact, and love; and it requires great intercession and plenty of time. But what an objective! The sweep and beauty of it grow upon the mind.

Christian union calls for action. Plenty of it. It must be communicated by properly qualified persons, that is by those who manifestly have the rich spirit of it abundantly in their own hearts. Heralds of unity are needed. Thousands of them. Hundreds of thousands of them. Millions of them. The importance, the desirability, and the imperative need of the unification of all the forces of the Church must be made matters of profound conviction in the mind of the Church Universal. Until the whole Church is made to smart and burn because of her divisions, until she can be brought to a crushing sense of her present apostacy, until she can be got on her knees in strong supplication for unity, the refreshment and passion and victorious sweetness of this great interest will not be upon the Church. Therefore, every union plea and every conciliative gesture, every earnest and unselfish word in behalf of this great cause, and every strong cry to man or God for more tolerance and a better co-operative spirit, will help, by so much, its coming.

And in all the history of the Church was there ever a major interest which appealed so irresistibly to the imagination as the concept of a truly united Church? Christ prayed for it. And the apostles in their day strove unceasingly to preserve it, and while they were with the Church in bodily presence they did so preserve it. As if anticipating a time when this blessed solidarity might get lost or broken, they issued distinct warnings against all those things that make for discord and confusion in the Church, and laid down certain beautiful and authentic rules and principles, by the observance of which it might be kept forever, or regained again if lost. Think of the glorious adventures in conciliation and the long vistas of romance and sacrificial experiences awaiting every one who enlists in this

great cause. Advocating Christian union is easy enough, but living it, putting the fine spirit of it into practice, that requires grace, courage, and imagination.

Christian union is a new interest. Many long and dreary centuries have intervened since Christian union was practiced by the Church. What would happen if the Church were to try it now? Nobody can know precisely, but we can all guess. Surely it would enrich the fellowship of the whole Church, endue her afresh with Pentecostal power, and enable her to exercise again and in a larger, finer way, that form of spiritual control without which society plunges headlong into waters of destruction.

Christian union as a classic and commanding interest of the Church has length and breadth and height and depth. It is difficult to conceive of a bigger or more unselfish enterprise. Whatever might be gained by conciliation and nearer approaches amongst the various bodies of Christendom would be shared by all. Even now Christian union appeals to millions of people as no other single great interest of the Church does, but its appeal could be multiplied a thousandfold. It quickens the hearts of multitudes whenever the sentiments of catholic unity are women into strong utterance by some speaking voice. It stirs the feelings of vast assemblies as they sing together some choice lyric of the Church extolling the beauties of unity and catholicity. Already the nationals of the Chinese Christian communions have developed a passion for unity. "Chinese Christians welcome union in every possible way," says C. I. Chang, "and are only held back from much closer union by the inability of their missionary friends to go with them." And India is thinking in terms of union. It may very well be that the strong currents of the rising interest in Christian union will come to us out of the East.

Christian union is a costly thing. The denominations of Christendom will have to make themselves poor in party pride that they may acquire treasures of a broader, richer fellowship. Traditions and sentiments which are now strongly held and greatly loved will have to go on the altar of sacrifice. And all

denominational households necessarily must be razed to the ground that the one true temple of the faith universal may rise in majesty and beauty. But when it is ultimately finished it will belong as much to each group as to others. It will be alike for all.

The big things of the Gospel are universal in their appeal, and they are essentially and eternally synthetic. And these great matters speak more immediately to the hearts than to the intellects of men. The denominational walls which serve so effectively to divide and keep asunder the numerous denominations of the Church are admittedly fabrications of the mind built up along the centuries, and they have thus been built up over the protests of the universal heart of the Church. The master-builders of the future who shall build the true and inclusive temple of the faith universal according to the Divine plan, will reject no element of the truth, no valid enduement or cultural grace of the Spirit dear to the hearts of groups that are least; for all "precious stones," cut and dressed with care and brought together from many denominational quarries shall all be required, each one of them being placed at length where it belongs, thus becoming an integral part of the ample temple of Christian Faith. But the enduring cement that shall hold them all fast together in indestructible union, is something the heart already knew while yet the intellect was dull and slow to comprehend.

Undoubtedly Christian union as an interest, objective, and passion, is a daring and difficult thing. Many frankly say it can never, on this earth, be accomplished. Obstacles of many kinds immediately occur to their minds. The tremendous stimulus given by the World War to all the reactionary influences of society—in politics, in education, and in religion—has borne heavily on all our progressive hopes and made the going extremely arduous for everybody engaged in constructive and conciliative enterprises. But in spite of the backwash of world intolerance and obscurantism and the "passionate despair" of all the defeatists, humanity is not going to scuttle the ship, nor is the Church of Christ going into voluntary bankruptcy.

Dark and troublous times constitute the rich loam which nourishes the plants whose bright flowers are the social hopes and dreams of the ages. And who knows but that the Church required the bitter disillusionments of a world war to point the way to a united Church, a warless world, and a great new day? Not that we are going to come suddenly upon these things just around some near turning of the road. By no means will Christian union come automatically. Problems and difficulties, multitudes of them, would quickly develop were the churches of Christendom to accept this high objective. Leaders of the movement would be harassed by members of their own communions, and they would often be misunderstood and misrepresented by other denominational groups. Heralds of this great interest would encounter every variety of persecution which man can devise. Heartburnings and heartaches would be their lot, as it has been the portion of the prophets that were before them. No, the sublime task of uniting the divided forces of the Church Universal of Christ is not an easy matter. It is superbly difficult.

And yet, if ever the thought-situation of an age pointed beforehand definitely to the coming major, then does the condition of mind in our day indicate the approaching grand interest for the Christian Church of these times. The religious world is becoming more and more dissatisfied with division and the insularities and futilities which divsion forever breeds, and is rapidly moving toward explicit repudiation of the whole theory and practice of denominationalism. The Church is by no means proud of her denominational status. Something akin to a feeling of shame is growing upon her as she reflects upon it. Chronologically the Christian union interest should, as logically it indubitably does, follow the great sixteenth century passion for religious freedom. The success of that great cause gave us Protestantism and a new world. But along with the blessings of spiritual emancipation came excessive individualism and party-mindedness in the Church. The Christian union interest is a movement toward a new solidarity, a vast and inclusive spiritual democracy composed of all followers of Christ.

When it comes—and sooner or later it must—it will be exposed always to those dangers and liable evermore to those abuses from which no free institutions ever have been exempt; but the fruits of its liberty and the benefits of its catholicity will outweigh all such disadvantages a thousand times.

Christian union is ordained of Christ. And it has long been due. It begins to look now as if it were coming. Voices from the East have spoken for union. And for a hundred years strong voices have been pleading for Christian union in America, in England, and on the Continent. In 1925 at Stockholm was held a Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work, and this year the World Conference on Faith and Order will convene in another of its meetings at Lausanne. Never before were so many minds of the Church thinking in terms of union or so many great hearts of the Church yearning for the day of its realization. But proclamation needs to go forward on a wider scale. The great interest is still shrouded in the mists of uncertainty and beheld from afar by people who cannot draw near because of their unbelief. Until this great objective shall have been lifted high in the mind of the Church and charged with the collective passion of Christendom, Christian union will remain in the land of beautiful dreams.

Having developed a passion for Christian union, the next step will be a thoroughgoing exploration of the grounds upon which union must come, and a careful consideration of the rules and principles by which the Church must be guided in her approaches, and then particular attention will have to be given to the kinds of attitudes which must be developed before the Church can proceed at all in this great enterprise. After that more councils and conferences on faith and order, more intercession, and a more general practice—in prepared communities and amongst adventurous groups—of the principles of union. This is already being done by community churches. These autonomous organizations are multiplying in a truly phenomenal manner, and they have anticipated the day of the wider solution of the great problems of Christian union by definitely resolving such problems in local communities. But the

task of generating the passionate interest required to launch the movement on a world scale is primary. And it staggers and fascinates the mind by its sheer magnitude and inherent difficulty. But if this mighty project is once raised to the level of real major importance in the mind and heart of the Church, if it actually comes to possess the momentum of valid major movement, can any one doubt for a moment that twentieth century Christianity will at once enter upon the greatest and most fruitful era she has known since the days of the apostles?

Confessedly the very best thing that can be said in favour of Christian union as a major interest for these times—and a vital concern for all times—is the fact that it was a part of the strategy of Christ. Clearly the apostles taught it as an essential, and practiced it as a rule, of faith. The ultimate evangelization of the world is pre-eminently the care of a united Church. The redemption of human society is a task utterly beyond the capacity of a divided Church.

Christian union as an ideal grips the imagination as few things can do. As a working hypothesis for the Church Universal Christian union is warming and wooing. It is of a piece with that radiant tissue of modern hopes implicit in the mind of our day. Impossible? Visionary? Hallucinative? So be it; then 'twere well the whole Church were inoculated with this Divine madness, and the sooner the better.

CHARLES LLOYD GARRISON.

Who seeks for Heaven alone to save his soul
May keep the path, but will not reach the goal:
While he who walks in love may wander far
But God will bring him where the Blessed are.

—Henry van Dyke.

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING

Cross Currents in the Tide of Christian Unity

THE day of division is past. Christian sentiment in all parts of the world is setting toward the reknitting of those fractures which have taken place in the last five centuries; indeed serious efforts are being made to cure the great schism of 1054.

Various motives are behind this new sentiment, some of which seem to have little concern with the Divine ideal of the Church. In this country a leading motive has been economy, the cutting down of duplication in Christian work locally. This is particularly stressed in the rural church field, as for example in the recent surveys in Ohio. It distresses practical Christians to support three churches where one will do.

Another motive arises from the freedom which the laity in America already exercise with regard to transfer between one denomination and another. The readiness of pastors to add to their own flocks without asking too many questions is the source of this new-found liberty. Many laymen, in consequence, feel very slightly the restrictions of denominational loyalty, and divisions seem to them inconsequential.

Then there are those who want the Church to speak with a united voice. Social and moral problems of to-day are insoluble by single groups. It is conceivable that a united Church could speak with a voice that would be heeded on questions of industrial and social welfare, and of international peace. This is the motive behind the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America and of the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work held at Stockholm in August, 1925.

But the most effective motive in producing action is the missionary motive. Our disunity is frustrating the gospel of brotherhood which we carry to heathen lands, and the very necessities of the situation have compelled mission groups to deal with the problem which we at home find it fairly easy to disregard. Thus we have the South India United Church, and just last year the United Church of Canada—for the origin of the United Church of Canada dates back twenty years to the

time when the three constituent bodies — the Methodists, Presbyterians, and Congregationalists of Canada — were facing the tremendous missionary problem of the newly settled west.

In all these motives it is sometimes hard to find much thought of the Divine ideal—Christ's will for the unity of his Church. This is not unnatural, for, of necessity among Protestants, the ideal of unity is generally interpreted as being what is called spiritual unity in contrast with organic unity. But traces of a recovery of this last conception are beginning to appear—e.g. the Free Catholic Movement in England and Dr. Cadman's notable lectures in Berkeley, California, recently published under the title *Christianity and the State.*

Reunion between related groups is being discussed actively by the Methodists in the United States, by the three Methodist groups in England, and by the two Presbyterian groups in Scotland. It is also being discussed by the missions in North India, and by the Anglican Mission and the South India United Church. All these discussions relate to organic unity.

The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America is but one of a series of national councils which made it possible for a committee on co-operation between the churches to propose recently an international council of national federations of churches. Copec in England in 1924 and the Conference on Life and Work in Stockholm in 1925 were likewise products of this effort to work together.

In our own country the recent growth of community churches has been a symptom of local feeling which we cannot disregard, however inadequate we may feel the remedy to be. So also the zeal with which the Student Conference at Evanston, Illinois, at the opening of 1926, leaped upon the denominational issue as the great evil of present day Christianity, even proposing to scrap the denominational young people's societies in their desire to do something about it.

If in all this review of recent activity the Roman Catholic Church seems to have been left out of the picture, it is not because she does not share the growing desire for unity, but merely because her policy does not permit her to take part in efforts toward corporate reunion. Nevertheless, she is watching intelligently and with deep interest, and it is even possible to say that there are signs of a new attitude. The Conversations at Malines had at least this value, that they represent a new effort to deal with the situation, and it is to be hoped that they will be continued under the successor to the great cardinal whose Catholic and Christian spirit made them possible.

As for the Eastern Orthodox churches, almost a revolution in their attitude has taken place since 1914. Disestablishment in Russia and persecution and suffering both in that country and in all the eastern lands have broken the isolation of centuries. The East is in touch with the West again. The first official representatives of the Eastern churches to attend a western gathering since the great schism sat at the World Conference meeting in Geneva in 1920, and even more notable, because of the nature of the meeting, was the impressive Orthodox delegation at the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work in 1925. Conferences in the interest of unity have been held in Egypt since 1920. The Near East Relief has done a tremendous work in bringing the Protestant churches of America into close and friendly touch with the Eastern churches.

It is unnecessary to speak of Anglicans in connection with this growing sentiment for unity. Our efforts have been increasing steadily, and in many of the movements referred to we have had a share. Particularly in England is the development of this desire for unity evident in the active official efforts that are being made to bring it to pass.

With all these converging influences, why is it that Christian unity delays? Why does it not descend upon us without further effort on our part?

II

The answer to this question is of critical importance. Failure to ask and answer it is responsible for a great deal of futile effort and blighted hope. Contrary to popular notions, our difficulty with regard to Christian unity is not in persuading people to desire it, but in the fact that everybody wants it *and has a particular plan for attaining it.*

If a person is ill his recovery is not hastened by the presence of twenty doctors, each trying to apply a different remedy, especially if they all disagree in the diagnosis. That roughly represents the situation to-day with regard to the disunion of Christendom. And the great difficulty is that we are all utterly sincere in proposing our particular cure, so sincere that we are determined that the patient must recover by our means or by none at all.

It is not easy to see ourselves in this character. In a certain sense it is logically impossible to do so, especially for Catholics. But practically it is a simple matter to convince ourselves that

the same assurance we feel with regard to the Catholic faith is felt with equal sincerity and intelligence by other human beings (much like ourselves) with regard to what they are pleased to call the Protestant faith. We can recognize this more easily if we reverse the position and look at Rome. Do we feel unchurched by Rome because, admittedly, we fail to qualify by the Roman standards? On the contrary, the more Rome dictates, the surer we feel of our own essential rightness. *Mutatis mutandis,* the Protestant of whatever variety feels equally immune from our proofs of validity and apostolic succession, and in fact is reinforced in his own opinions by what seem to him our obvious errors.

Consider some of these cross-currents, these conflicting programmes for unity, which are being earnestly proffered to-day by the friends of unity. First of all there are the denominational programmes. It is well known that the Anglicans have such a programme; they issued it officially in 1888 and have been reissuing it ever since. It is equally well known that the Romans have a programme. The Lutherans and the Presbyterians are supposed, and rightly, to have some definite views as to the terms on which reunion ought to be achieved. But it is also true that the congregational or non-creedal bodies, the Disciples, Baptists, Congregationalists, and Quakers, have equally definite notions as to how unity can be secured. To the Disciples, their "plea" for Christian unity is as important a contribution as the Lambeth Appeal seems to Episcopalians. The true Congregationalist honestly believes that the polity which works so well in holding the Congregational churches together is the true method for the Church Universal along the lines of Scriptural democracy and individual responsibility.

These clean-cut denominational programmes have been somewhat disturbed by a new element that has appeared in recent times. There is an increasing number of those in all denominations whose key to the problem is the formula, "Differences make no difference." They specifically desire a unity based on freedom to disagree. "The only sort of unity that I am interestd in," writes one, "is unity of the inclusive sort, which assures full liberty for differences in opinion and progress in thought." And the Evanston Student Conference roundly declared that the Church of the future must be based upon complete freedom of belief.

This group suffers particularly from the difficulty of being unable to see itself as the proposer of a particular programme. The formula seems so broad and liberal — "you can have a creed if you wish it, provided you do not impose it on me"— that they find it hard to see its exclusiveness in respect to others. It is doubtful also if they would really be ready to admit anything more than Protestant varieties of doctrinal differences; the Congregationalists in England are finding it rather hard to assimilate the Rev. W. E. Orchard.

Another programme, into which these conceptions tend to drive such persons, is the comity programme — exchange of pulpits, delimitation of territory, union services, etc. War experience encouraged this method. Even to Anglicans, the open pulpit has ceased to be a bogie—certainly they fail to make the same protest against it that they did in earlier years. In justice it must be recognized that this programme, whatever its mistakes, does represent a real gain. Rivalry, jealousy, and bitterness between churches are not yet extinct, and we still need to preach good-will and friendliness. Nevertheless, one always feels a suspicion that the desire to emphasize agreements and to avoid "divisive issues" is due to an underlying fear that the spirit of hostility is still latent.

Comity is an individual programme; federation is a corporate programme. Its scheme is to unite on what we have in common. It appeals also to those who view the problem of unity as involving recognition of the equal status of all churches. That is where the rub comes—the assumption that federation is itself unity. Thus the constitution of the Federal Council states, "The object of this Council shall be to express the fellowship and catholic unity of the Christian Church." On this account not only Episcopalians but Lutherans and Southern Baptists find themselves embarrassed in allying themselves officially with the Council.

Probably the greatest benefit that has come from federated movements is their demonstration that practical co-operation is impossible without agreement on matters of principle. This became clearly evident when the extension of the co-operative programme to a world-wide scale was attempted at Stockholm in 1925. Prohibition and world peace proved not to be the unifying topics at that gathering which they are among the Protestant churches in America. Questions arose there which scarcely appear on the American horizon. Yet even in America

federation does not find it possible to speak with a united voice on every issue.

Practical co-operation of this sort must go on. Our own Lambeth Conference has declared its necessity. It would help matters much if the Episcopal Church could make up its mind as to its relation to the Federal Council and act consistently. Mutual acquaintance and regard are by-products of such co-operation, and these make for unity. And most of all, the effort to work together makes more evident the necessity of dealing with matters of Faith and Order. A shining example of this is the work of the Near East Relief, which began as an effort simply to save the lives of children, and is now involved in the task of teaching those children the faith of the Orthodox Church by means of teachers and material supplied by American Protestantism.

Another programme that must be mentioned is the immediate action programme—"Let us practice unity, not talk about it." A fine statement of this programme appeared in the *Churchman* about a year ago from the pen of Dr. Reiland. There are many who feel as he does, that we are wasting time in discussions when we ought to be giving practical evidence of our purpose for unity. The error in this position of course is the assumption that we are isolated units and can act as such. But John Brown and Wendell Phillips did not solve the slavery problem. They only performed the useful service of drawing attention to it. In this sense the earnest workers for immediate action may indeed be said to serve the cause of unity. A striking example was the recent conference at Watford, England, where the committee in charge in all good faith, invited the members of the conference to begin the day with a Communion service. The result was withdrawal of acceptances and finally canceling of the conference, but the ensuing correspondence revealed astonishing misunderstandings which might never have come to light except for such precipitate action.

Another programme, in which recently Anglicans have been particularly active, is the sort which tries to secure unity by specific formula. "If we will all agree on this and this and this, then we can have unity." This is the familiar formula of all denominational programmes, but it has also been used for programmes intended to be interdenominational. The most important example of this is the "mutual commissioning of ministers" suggested by the Lambeth Appeal to all Christian People as a possible means of solving the problem of disunity.

The history of the Lambeth Appeal is one of which Anglicans have every right to be proud. Its high purpose and noble motive are so evident that they have been acknowledged on every side even by those who have most earnestly disagreed with the proposal. It has marked a change in temper, particularly in England between the Established and Free Churches. It has resulted in a series of joint conferences held during the last five years between committees of the Church of England and of the Federal Council of Free Churches appointed to elucidate certain points of the Appeal on which the Free Churches desired light. The official statements issued by these conferences have been collected and published in a small book edited by Dean Bell of Canterbury and the Rev. W. L. Robertson of the Free Church Committee. The conferences have been suspended by mutual consent, to give opportunity for further consideration by the churches of the matters under discussion. It seems apparent, however, that the discussions had reached a deadlock over the question as to the status of the present Free Church ministers and their need of Episcopal ordination.

To understand the importance of this outcome it is necessary to realize that the Appeal deliberately avoids raising questions of "theory" in proposing Episcopal ordination as the means of securing a ministry universally acceptable. The whole effort of these conferences has been to secure a practicable formula on which all could agree to act without involving subscription to any theory. In consequence "the historic episcopate" is the phrase that is used in all discussions; the word "priest" never appears. This method proved more or less successful up to the point of agreement as to future practice with regard to ordination in the reunited Church, but it met difficulty when the question was raised as to the present Free Church ministers—must they receive Episcopal ordination or (as the phrase goes) "commission"? In answer to a specific question the Anglican members of the conference declared that they felt it was in accordance with the spirit of the Lambeth Appeal to say that the ministries of the Free Churches were true ministries of the Word and Sacraments within Christ's Church, but they also insisted that the tradition of the Church of England, as well as considerations of reunion with the East and with Rome, rendered necessary the stipulation that those who had not received Episcopal ordination should receive it. This, of course, proved unacceptable to the Free Churches, looking indeed like withdrawing with one hand what was offered with

the other. The Bishop of Gloucester has proposed a further formula as a way to solve the difficulty, namely that all ministries should be "recognized" but that there should be no interchange of ministration, but this seems to find little favour.

We have here a fine example of the futility of a specific programme to secure unity; even the most nobly conceived and most sincerely urged programme. The plain fact is that we are not ready for formulas. It is the very multiplicity of formulas which blocks our way toward the unity that we all desire.

III

Amid all this conflict of purposes, each trying to convince the others that his way is the true way, we shall never make progress. We must be realists as well as idealists and face this situation intelligently.

That is where the proposal for a World Conference on Faith and Order differs from every other project for Christian unity. It is a proposal to face the situation as it exists and, whatever our individual convictions as to the rightness of our own position, to recognize that others are equally sincere and (so far as academic standards can show) equally intelligent. The problem for us to study is why our respective programmes are unsatisfactory to other groups. Without that knowledge we are simply groping in the dark.

That is the first purpose of conference—to get the facts. We do not know other people's ideas. The notions which we hold about their beliefs and practices are almost inconceivably absurd, except as we occasionally find out what wild notions they have of our own ways. This misunderstanding of each other is the natural result of controversial methods. Controversy involves distortion. By making a man's reasons appear as poor as I can, it is easier to disprove them. Of course the reasons do not appear so poor to him, and that is why argument of this sort usually fails to convince the opponent. But it is tremendously useful in building up the morale of our own group. If we can teach our people that Roman Catholics believe that all you have to do to be forgiven your sin is to confess it to the priest, or that Protestants believe this or that heresy, it is very comforting to our own souls. And so we go on commending ourselves for virtues which we politely refrain from bragging about in public, thereby never discovering that others think they are possessed of them also. For example, some Protestants believe that they have an exclusive claim to the

belief that each man can say his own prayers, or as it is usually phrased "the right of the direct access of each soul to God." But it is not possible for them to say this in the hearing of members of some other group without having a vigorous protest raised. For it simply is not true that we are divided on this issue. And this is only one of an incredible number of popular misconceptions from which even the leaders of the various groups are not free.

By sitting down together and speaking freely it will be possible at least to get the facts straight. It is an axiom too little observed that no man can state another man's position for him. Only by statement and question and further statement can we arrive at a basis of fact acceptable to both sides.

The second step in conference is to analyze the apparent conflicts between the various views. Just where is the point of divergence? The popular formulations of the various issues between the Churches are useless—as, for example, that Catholics believe in sacraments and Protestants do not. So in the case of the ministry. What is the real point at issue as between those who hold to Episcopal ordination and those who believe in some other form? Real progress will be made if we can come to an agreement as to what the issue actually is, even if the two (or three) sides should seem irreconcilable.

That leads to the third step, namely, discussion—exploratory discussion, as Bishop Gore has termed the Conversations at Malines. This is the aspect of conference which few people seem to grasp. Discussion usually means argument. But in this effort it must be carried on with the purpose of explaining, not proving. The purpose of conference is inquiry.

To many this seems a slow and theoretical process. As a matter of fact, however, it is the only process which holds out hope for agreement. We have tried for generations to convince other Christians by converting them to our point of view and we have made no appreciable progress. Even Rome, the most able advocate of this method, with vastly preponderant resources, has failed to make it succeed. The reason is simple—argument provokes argument, and while you convert one you fortify in their previous convictions a dozen others by compelling them to seek reasons in defense of their cherished views.

Conference proposes as its sole purpose the agreement that comes from understanding and free, unforced thinking. If such agreement is impossible, then unity is impossible, but it would be faithlessness to believe that. However fixed the dis-

agreements of Christians may seem, faith must hold that by thinking together we shall with God's help come to think alike, for truth is one.

[From Rev. Floyd W. Tompkins, Jr., in *The American Church Monthly,* New York.]

Some Conditions of Reunion

THERE is one subject above all others which we should consider together and that is the subject of Christian unity. Unity is one of the very first things, and the big things. Until the Church seriously grapples with this question her work in the world is doomed to remain relatively ineffective. Men are beginning to understand that a distracted, divided and broken world cannot be adequately ministered to by a Church which is itself broken and divided. But it is clear that the rents and tears of centuries cannot be mended in a day, or even in a generation. It is going to be a long business. And the higher your ideal of unity the stiffer does the task appear. I must own that I am one of those who cannot be satisfied with any lesser hope than that of organic union. The New Testament ideal of the Body of Christ does not seem to me to be fulfilled by friendly understandings, or loose alliances or carefully limited co-operations. I want to see the spirit of unity embodied in a visible organization: a Church of world-wide extent and containing within it an enormously rich variety of group life, but genuinely one Church.

THE STEEP PATH

That view, for many of us, first took shape after the great Lambeth Conference of 1920. The six years since have not dimmed the glory of the vision, but they have shown us that the path which leads toward it is steeper and harder than we thought. If anyone asks to-day how the cause of reunion is getting on, it has to be replied that, so far as concerns actual inter-church negotiations on disputed subjects proceedings have reached a halt—I refuse to use the word deadlock, for I do not believe that it will prove to be a deadlock. The negotiations which have throughout been conducted in an admirably Christian spirit, and which have revealed a great deal of really substantial agreement, have reached what seems for the time to be

an insuperable barrier in the question of the Christian ministry. Is there anything that can be done, and if so, what?

A Campaign of Enlightenment

Let me try to say in plainest language what, in my humble judgment, can be done now to bring the day of reunion nearer. What I have to suggest relates partly to the importance of a right attitude of mind, partly to practical things which might be taken in hand forthwith. With regard to the first, I should like to see a great campaign of enlightenment and inspiration among the rank and file of the churches. There is too big a gap between the leaders and the led. The leaders of the various Christian communions are much farther ahead than the members of their respective churches. The next big move in reunion, I believe, ought to come, and will come, from below. The great church public need a new mental attitude in this matter.

Penitence and Thanksgiving

This attitude of mind about reunion which I have been indicating will, among other things, involve penitence; a really deep shame and genuine contrition that we in the churches have strayed so far away from the mind of Christ. It will also involve thanksgiving: thanksgiving for the great and rich variety within the family fellowship of Christ. My notion of reunion does not in the least mean a heavy flattening out of our differences into one thin and dreary level. Strong life always means rich variety. Why should not Christians and churches learn, as a normal and ordinary Christian duty, to give thanks to God for the glorious variety of thought and experience within the great Church of Christ? Think of the many and varied streams which blend and mix in the great broad river of corporate Christian life. Consider, for instance, the three indispensable elements in all true Christian experience: the Evangelical, the Catholic, the Liberal—and I use those terms in the widest possible sense. Then there are the distinctive contributions made by the several Christian communions. As for my own Church of England, it is hard for me, one of her sons, to attempt to say in a sentence what she stands for. We do, perhaps, deserve to be called what we have been called, "the roomiest church in Christendom," and possibly we preserve and utilize the peculiar British characteristic of being able to blend opposites; we believe both in mysticism and in sound learning, we endeavour

to combine freedom with discipline, fresh experiment with ancient tradition. Some have felt that we stand providentially in the middle position, able to reach out a hand to churches on either side.

Further Steps

I have been saying something about the need of a change of mind in the rank and file of the church. I go on to ask, secondly, what can we in the Christian Church at the present time actually do to obey the mind of Christ in the matter of Christian unity? There seems to me a good deal that might be done, and done at once without raising acutely controversial questions of church Order. For instance, most churches might do far more than is at present being done to create opportunities for the corporate expression of Christian aspiration in the matter of reunion. Why should, not only prayers for unity, but expressions of thanksgiving on the line that I have already mentioned, not find a regular place in congregational worship of the different churches? And besides this, why should there not be arranged from time to time inter-congregational acts of worship? I want to see more occasions on which members of different churches can meet, not just to discuss or to organize or to listen to speeches, but simply to pray together, either quite informally or in carefully prepared acts of worship. If reunion negotiations are ever to prove successful, there will have to be beneath them and behind them a deep-down spiritual sympathy and an affinity of spiritual outlook among the rank and file of all the churches who propose to come together. In this same connection, I should like to see an extension of the practice of an interchange of pulpits. In addition to these experiments in praying together I should like to see an ever-increasing co-operation between the churches in the tremendous enterprise of spreading Christ's Kingdom in these islands and throughout the world. The ideal church would to-day be producing everywhere this clearly marked group life or family life, animated by a single motive and unitedly loyal to all that Christ stands for, and so gradually leavening and permeating the civilizations of the world until those civilizations lie wholly within the Kingdom of God. A big vision if you like, but one which the church loses at its peril. And it is surely obvious that fellowship on this scale can only be given to the world by a church that throughout its length and breadth is at unity in itself.

Christ in an Alien World

I spoke just now of the church setting forth the way of Christ in an alien world. It needs the best joint thinking on the part of all the churches to discover what precisely is the way of Christ amidst the baffling industrial, economic, social, and political problems which beset us on every side to-day. Hence the untold value of Copec and such movements. And, above all, we need to act together in any large-scale organized attempts to bring the message of living Christianity, to bring Christ Himself, to the great multitudes in this and other lands who stand completely aloof from the life of the Christian Church. It goes without saying that what is true of evangelism at home is truer still of the missionary enterprise abroad.

The Great Adventure

One more word as I finish. "Humanity," General Smuts once said in a notable speech, "has struck its tents and is once more on the march." That, I believe, is true of the post-war world, though I am inclined to think the pace of the marching is slowing down again; and it is also in a measure true of the post-war church. There are signs of movement; there are tremblings and swellings going on beneath the hard crust of habit and tradition and prejudice. The church is surely feeling dimly that she is confronted to-day by a challenge and an opportunity second to none in all her history, and there is a deep, if somewhat wistful, longing to be able to answer that summons. I sometimes have a feeling that God is trying to say something to the Church of our day; and I am sometimes terribly afraid that the Church will not stop to listen. To be loyal to ecclesiastical traditions, to be punctilious in morals and orthodox in doctrine, is just not enough; and it will not do instead of trying to hear what God is saying to our generation; if you are going to do that you must cast away prejudice and be quiet and listen. Hence the crucial importance of a revived prayer-life in the Church. If we are ready to listen, if as we find out what Christ's will is in our modern life we are prepared to plunge recklessly into the adventure of doing it, it may mean a drastic upsetting, overturning of ancient opinions and preconceived ideas; it may mean an overwhelming change of values, it may mean a revolution in our church life, but we shall at least find ourselves stepping forward clear-eyed and light-hearted on the highway of God.

[From Canon E. S. Woods in a recent sermon in St. Giles' Cathedral, Edinburgh.]

The Church the Mother of Us All

A great mistake that is commonly made by Christians is to confound the real Church of God with some special earthly representative of it. The true Church, that Church of which Paul wrote and which Christians everywhere confess when they repeat the Apostles' Creed, is not tied fast to any particular city, or nation, or people; it is not bound up with any particular ecclesiastical organization; it is not to be identified with cathedrals, candlesticks, robes, altars, ceremonies, traditions, and the like. These are but the mediums through which it manifests its presence in the world, the outer trappings with which it is adorned by human hands. The real Church, the real Kingdom of God is within the hearts of men. What Jerusalem is to-day without Christianity, what a scaffolding is without a building, what a building is without a living occupant, what a body is without a soul,—that a so-called Christian city or temple or organization is without a "fellowship of faith and the Holy Ghost in hearts," as Melanchthon expresses it in his eloquent commentary and defense of the Augsburg Confession — the apology. With what fine satire he punctures Roman Catholic ceremonialism when he says: "And if the style of clothing is not worship of God, necessary for righteousness before God, it follows that men can be righteous, and sons of God and the Church of Christ, even though they use a costume that is not German, but French."

This holy, catholic, or universal Church, which Paul designates as the "Jerusalem which is above," and which he endearingly calls "the mother of us all," is the spiritual commonwealth of believers whose citizenship is in heaven—the real communion of saints, "who agree concerning the Gospel, and have the same Christ, the same Holy Ghost, and the same sacraments, or have human traditions that are the same or dissimilar" (Apology). It is not coterminous with the Greek Church, or the Roman Church, or any particular segment of the Protestant Church, or with all these churches put together. Its metes and bounds are known only to Him who alone can number the saints that are his—who calls his sheep by name, who knows them, and who is known to them. It is a hidden Church, encased in a Church which men can see — just as gold lies hidden in the nugget, ore in the mine, wheat in the chaff. In the winter, all limbs and branches on the tree seem alike living and capable of bearing fruit; it is only when spring comes that the living parts of the tree can be distinguished from the dead parts. The

Church on earth is in the winter stage of its existence; its living parts can be discerned only by Him who is the life of the Church and who has set the time when the true Church shall emerge out of its earthly encasement and shall stand revealed in its spring-like, resurrection glory. In the spring, the trees are white with blossoms; but not every blossom is an unfailing pledge of coming fruit. To the eye of faith and hope it stands for fruit; but that is all. Spring promises vastly more than autumn fulfils. A chilly wind, a frost, a storm, a drought, a defect in the bud, the sting of insects, and what not, may visit the blossoming tree; and when the harvest comes only here and there has a blossom fulfilled its promise. So with this hidden Church, made up of believing souls scattered throughout the world and connected with the visible Church, which is the Church of promise and not of fulfilment.

But the bond of union, the life-giving sap that courses through this living tree and makes it one, is the Holy Spirit operating through the word. This Church is both saved and saving — saved with respect to its membership, saving with respect to the word. The Church in her inner essence and power, through word and sacrament, becomes the organ of the Holy Spirit for the redemption of mankind. She can have no more appropriate and endearing name than mother. She begets children and is the bearer of saving grace to men. Unlike the Jerusalem of the old dispensation, which through the traditions of men was in bondage with her children, this Jerusalem which is from above is free. She stands for the new dispensation, for the Gospel of faith as over against works, of an all-sufficient and atoning Saviour as over against the sacrifice of bulls and goats. To her are committed the oracles of God, and through her God has chosen to make known his grace, his saving health among all nations. She is the elect heavenly virgin with never-failing supply of oil in her lamps. This oil gives her light, and enables her to give light unto others without dimming, but rather enhancing, the brilliancy of her own light. To this mother, filled with the spirit of God, in travail for the souls of men, begetting spiritual children, nourishing them with the milk and the meat of the word, and adding daily to her number such as are being saved; to this commonwealth of God's elect, this spiritual priesthood of believers, this communion of saints, this hidden yet visible Church, He who is her Head and Lord is ever saying, as if addressing each individual member: "Ye are the light of the world; a city that is set on a hill cannot be hid."

Though visible only to the eye of faith, this mother, dwelling in the holy of holies of the Church visible, is making constant intercession for mankind, through the only name that is recognized in heaven. The true Church is not an imaginary, intangible something, having existence only in some Utopia of man's creation (In one sense only can it be called a Utopia; for it is confined to no particular place); it is a real spiritual commonwealth with unfailing outward marks or signs—the Gospel and the sacraments—and is making its presence known and felt in the world, and will continue to do so to the end of time. Precious, heavenly mother, who can learn to know Jesus, who can learn to know the Father, but through Thee?

[From *The Lutheran,* Philadelphia, Pa.]

The Reunion Impasse

In the recent convocation of Canterbury an important discussion on re-union took place. The debate was on a resolution moved by the bishop of Truro that "this house commends to the prayerful consideration of the Church the series of documents that have emerged from the recent conversations between Anglican and Nonconformist representatives at Lambeth, and are printed in Bell and Robertson's *The Church of England and the Free Churches.*" These indicated lines along which the impossible could be looked for to be brought about by God's providence; they showed a surprising openness of road; there had been acceptances on both sides of other points of view, and an enlargement of outlook. The ideal was not yet dead.

The discussion following proved how much has yet to be done. The ordinary member in every church felt no keenness to face the question. But is the apathy to be wondered at when the nature of the problem—its bigness, its intricacy, its "explosive" nature—is properly considered? One can imagine a member of a particular denomination, secure in his own church's beliefs, proud of it, busy in its tasks, asking, "With whom am I to re-unite?" His has always been to him the church and has "split off" from no other in his time. Willingness to co-operate with others appeals to him, but "re-union" causes no emotion. He pays no heed to the number and variety of churches calling themselves Christian, with differing aspects of the Christian faith, but all claiming loyalty to the teaching of our Lord.

We may contemplate the possibility of some forms of

union, but "re-union" in the sense of a general return to some "true fold" is neither desirable nor wanted by those who are seriously considering the question. We have made headway. Fellow Christians are beginning to understand one another, to agree where they can, and in matters where agreement is not yet possible to see the other side's reason for things. No one can profess the faith in exactly the same way as do others even in his own church. The very fact that all denominations are much more alive and active in real service makes for differences within the whole.

An "impasse" means we have been making efforts, but have somehow stuck for the time. Lord Irwin's remark about politics applies also to religious matters, "With politics, as with bootlaces, patience alone will untie the knots."

It is only within recent years that people have had patience to examine the knot, to see the possibility of undoing it. The will-to-unity, if it exists, is the first step on the road to attaining it.

Many have never faced the question, "Was it a good thing that the Church did break up into so many sections?" What is called "schism" may be looked at from more than one point of view. Good has come out of evil, if it be thought that all separation has been evil. There was good reason for the rise of the different denominations and for their persistence. (Gamaliel's attitude to questions of difference may be recommended to this age.) The positive contributions of the Free Churches to the spiritual stock of the world cannot be ignored. Would that contribution have been the same if there had been no breaking off from the parent church? Does it not seem as if the purpose of God—so little understood by us—has in all this variety been making for a larger and a truer oneness? Do we yet understand what is meant by the "one Church"?

Our own particular church has good reason for feeling that her mission is God-given, but this applies equally to others. The greatest drawbacks to real union are our inheritances from the past: latent hostility, prejudice, fear, and a certain measure of wilfulness. Put these aside and study facts: these may teach us that, whatever be the pain involved in giving life to new forms, it is justified.

How may these different bodies learn to dwell together in unity? It is a family matter. You cannot make unity by ejecting any particular member from the family, nor can you make for union by ignoring differences. These in some senses are

extremely important, in so far as they manifest something of the manifold glory of Christ.

The bishop of Manchester, in *Personal Religion and the Life of Fellowship* (p. 31), points out that depreciation of difference will not bring about real reunion. "Grafting" and not "amputation" expresses the real way to achieve union. The "Lambeth Quadrilateral" states broadly the position of the Church of England. As the basis of the reunited Church there must be (a) the Canonical Scriptures; (b) the faith set forth in the historic Creeds; (c) the two sacraments ordained by Christ; (d) a universally recognized ministry. These are essentials. The points give much scope for debate in these days of unsettlement, but they do represent the essential foundation for any church that is to be Christian. Taking them as they stand they represent the conviction of the majority of Christian people.

How shall we reunite, or gain that higher unity? The missionary experience of the churches has shown that union will come more quickly, more naturally, more easily, when the churches are truly Apostolic, intent on winning the world, not for themselves, but for Christ. Our mission, the world-hunger for Christ, will make us put our house in order, make us long for the real fellowship of all his servants in his service.

Reunion must happen, but we cannot date history until it is history. Meanwhile, we must adopt and adapt St. Paul's words, "We press on toward the goal," and that, the fulfilment of our Lord's Prayer, "that they may be one." Oneness is an achievement that will need prayer, patience, and the accommodation of our personal, denominational peculiarities to the efficiency and well-being of the whole fellowship.

[From Rev. H. L. Ingham, B.D., in *The Bolton Evening News,* Bolton, England.]

BOOK REVIEWS

CARDINAL MERCIER. By Georges Goyau. With a Preface by the Rt. Hon. Viscount Halifax. London: Longmans, Green and Co.; 75 pages, price $1.25.

Since the passing of Cardinal Mercier, and, more recently, the Abbé Portal, there appears to be no Roman Catholic sufficiently interested in the reunion of Christendom to take up the work that these Christian gentlemen laid down. We regret this very much. The conversations at Malines are among the most outstanding instances of Roman Catholics to talk over our unhappy divisions with those not of their household. The powerful influence of Cardinal Mercier caused these conversations to be favourably considered at the Vatican.

There is something both amusing and pathetic, however, about these conversations. If two individuals should have a quarrel and either of these churches should advise that the participants in the quarrel should be as cautious as they have been in these conversations, they would not hold the common respect of the world very long. The Anglicans have been more willing to talk with Roman Catholics than Roman Catholics have been to talk with them; but, on the other hand, the Anglicans have been for years almost as cautious in their approaches to Nonconformists. Both bodies, however, have been improving in this respect, which is to be commended, but the mystery is why Christian men, who are separated by theological interpretations and ecclesiastical practices, do not yearn for fellowship with the whole Church of Christ, especially when these men of great minds and great hearts, holding exalted positions, could influence mightily for goodwill and fellowship in the whole Church.

But Cardinal Mercier is an example of one who, in his exalted position, did yearn for the unity of the Church. Perhaps he would not have gone so far in conversations with Presbyterians and Methodists, but we rejoice that he was eager to hold conversations with the Anglo-Catholic party of the Anglican Church. In this brief story of his life by M. Goyau, Lord Halifax pays him a beautiful tribute in the preface. For two centuries the Merciers have been Belgian, starting as farmers and afterward becoming tradesmen. The battle of Waterloo was fought on a part of their farm. The Cardinal was born November 21, 1851. His people were poor. His earliest dreams centered around the altar before which he daily knelt. "He wanted to be one who loves God and brings others to love Him." He was greatly influenced by three early teachers: M. Roberts, who taught him to obey; M. La Force, who taught him to work and persevere; M. Pieraerts, who taught him to dare. He spent two years of philosophical studies in the

Small Seminary of Malines. He read the *Summa* and loved it. He familiarized himself with the writings of the Fathers, he read daily the epistles of Paul and got many of them to memory, all of which helped to make him a messenger of Jesus Christ.

During his studies in the University of Louvain he was distressed by the attacks of Rationalism upon Faith, he experienced a certain revengeful pleasure in seeing Lamennais, Bonald, Bautain, and others humiliate Reason and make Tradition the only source of moral and metaphysical truth. But Rome did not want to see Reason too much despised; she defended Reason against the attacks of Traditionalism. Under Leo XIII Thomist philosophy revived in Catholic teaching and Mercier was appointed to that new chair in the University of Louvain, in which he audaciously threw a bridge across the gap separating the speculations of the Middle Ages from the most modern methods of observation. He urged Catholics to cultivate the field of science. Said he: "You resign yourselves too readily to play the secondary part of 'adepts' of science and too few of you are eager to work at creative science, too few are willing to gather and to fashion the materials from which, in the future, the new synthesis of Christian science and philosophy must be built." In 1906 Pius X made him Archbishop of Malines and Cardinal. The inner rhythm of his life was based on a perfect balance between study and prayer. In his two books of instruction, *A mes Séminaristes* and *Retraite Pastorale*, the founder of neoscholasticism took his place with such great doctors as Thomas Aquinas, Bonaventure, and Duns Scotus, who were at once masters of prayer and thought. In his pastoral work he sought to be the friend of all and in his fearless outburst of indignation against Germany's invasion of Belgium he became a world figure. He was a beautiful character and his influence for the reunion of Christ's flock will ever remain as his best contribution to a better world. This little book is a beautiful story.

Recollections and Reflections. By Newman Smyth. With Commemorative Addresses by Benjamin W. Bacon, D.D., LL.D., Rev. Peter Ainslie, Rt. Rev. James De Wolf Perry, Jr. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons; 224 pages, price $1.50.

Foremost in the cause of Christian unity stood Dr. Newman Smyth. He may be regarded as the rightful successor in America of Dr. Philip Schaff in this field of activity. He had a passion for Christian unity that was irresistible. He could not be drawn off the subject. He would not give up. I remember my last visit in his home. I had scarcely passed over the threshold of the door when he plunged into some Christian unity problem and, without letting up, that was the one theme of conversation until I bade him goodbye, and the next day a long letter came from him telling me

of the things that he had overlooked in our conversation. He was the greatest inspiration to this cause in our American life.

This volume of recollections and reflections, which he finished a few days before his death, is one of the most interesting books in personal recollections that can be found. From the opening picture of himself as a little boy lying in the grass beneath an apple tree in his father's garden, waiting to see some ripe apples fall, looking up into the blue sky, watching the passing clouds, and wondering what there would be if there were nothing, to the last chapter, with a picture of himself sitting in the ripeness of age, reflecting upon the past, is a delightful and courageous recital of interesting experiences and events. His intellectual life was for him the assertion and reconciliation of a mystical and skeptical heredity. He attended a private school in the home of Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe. He, with other boys, often camped on the islands of Casco Bay. Once, coming upon a little Roman Catholic Chapel, they slipped in the door and, with boyish curiosity, dipped their fingers in the basin of holy water and made the sign of the cross, which, he says, was his first initiation into church unity. At twelve years of age he was sent to Phillips Academy; at sixteen he entered Bowdoin College. For several years he was in the Civil War. When mustered out he went to Andover Seminary and later studied in Germany. His first pastorate was a Congregational Chapel in Providence, R. I.; then he went to the First Congregational Church, Bangor, Maine; then to the First Presbyterian Church, Quincy, Ill.; closing his ministry with Center Church, New Haven, Conn.

His first book—*The Religious Feeling*—appeared during his pastorate at Quincy, and from that time to this volume his pen was busy. His books sometimes were storm centers, but to the inquiring and scientific minds they were guide posts to larger liberty in personal experience with God. His scientifically trained mind hesitated at no field of adventure. With enthusiasm he went everywhere and found in his scientific data new challenges from spiritual experience. His *Old Faiths in New Light, Constructive Natural Theology, Passing Protestantism and Coming Catholicism,* and *Meaning of Personal Life* are some of the books that opened a new world to students.

His activity in social problems made him an outstanding figure in New Haven, but the crowning work of his life was Christian unity. On the rise of the World Conference on Faith and Order, he was appointed chairman of the commission to the Nonconformist churches of Great Britain and he led his cause there and in subsequent service in America with the courage and passion of a prophet. He made a deep impression wherever he arose to speak on this subject and would go any distance for conference with those who were thinking in terms of reconciliation.

The book closes with three commemorative addresses delivered at the

memorial services in Center Church, New Haven, several months after his death. The whole book makes a very readable volume—just large enough to be an introduction to the many books that Dr. Smyth wrote and every chapter so thoroughly characteristic of him that its humor and insight brings him constantly to mind. We wish for it a large and deserving circulation.

PREACHING IN THEORY AND PRACTICE. By Samuel McComb, D.D. New York: Oxford University Press; 228 pages.

Here is a book of high merit. Even though preaching has fallen upon evil days, with sermons "flat, dull, uninteresting, out of relation to the needs of the age, sentimental, over-intellectual or not intellectual enough, platitudinous, impotent, devoid of human appeal"—in spite of this discouraging condition, preaching is the finest of arts and in this day there are many pulpits showing forth the highest example of good preaching.

Out of the preacher's concern with religion and the ultimate values of the spiritual life, Dr. McComb has done a real service to the pulpit in this book. It may be used as a help to preachers of all communions—practical, painstaking, and thoughtful. The chapters on preparation for preaching and the psychology of preaching (two chapters on each subject) are most timely and helpful. All of the chapters are refreshing.

The value of this book lies largely in calling the preacher to be an up-to-date man by gaining a new and compelling vision of the age and a new and compelling sense of his responsibility to God for the delivery of the message of life to men and women. It is so strong and clear and practical that one cannot suppress the wish that it might be read by every preacher. It will not only take its place as one of the best books that has been written on this subject in recent years, but it will hold that place for many years to come.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT. By Principal A. E. Garvie, D. D. (Oxford Society of Historical Theology, England). Principal Garvie always writes well. In this paper, which was read before the Oxford Society of Historical Theology, he treats his subject with fresh interest and gives to it a new valuation. He finds the development of the conception of the Holy Spirit in the Old Testament and discovers the difference which Christ made of it in New Testament study. Tracing its development through church history, he brings us to the situation to-day. He says: "It is the convergence of the concepts of *social personality* and *personal community* which brings us nearest to conceiving God as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit: and as these concepts are more distinctly defined by psychol-

ogy and sociology, we may hope to gain categories of thought more adequate than those of the ecclesiastical dogma." He wisely says further: "But we need more than the categories of thought: we need the experience of the love of God, as revealed in the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and realized in the community or common possession *(Koinonia)* of the Holy Spirit."

SECTARIAN SHACKLES. By Libbie Miller Travers. New York: The Macmillan Company; 149 pages, $1.50.

This is a clever story of one who was reared in the Middle West of the United States, in those days when sectarianism dominated all communities, and who later threw off sectarian shackles and became sympathetic toward all other Christians. Those early days had their vigour and strength. There were searching of the Scriptures, earnest prayer, and constant religious debates. Books were scarce and information was so limited that Mrs. Travers tells that she was almost grown before she knew that the Protestant Reformation did not begin with Alexander Campbell. Her Disciple household was characteristic of that day, where all truth centered in one denomination. With the change of environment and wider reading and the influence of Chautauqua came tolerance and sympathy, giving to her a new breadth of horizon. It is a long road to the open mind. Many have had similar experiences from their denominational households into the larger fellowship, whether those households were Disciple, or Methodist, or Presbyterian, or Roman Catholic. There is going on to-day among all denominations the discovery on the part of the people that religious denominationalism is false and unspiritual. It is an interesting book, reads well, and is true to human experience.

THE GROUP SPIRIT IN CHURCH LIFE. By E. T. Slater, Rector of Beckbury, England. With Preface by the Bishop of Manchester. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge; 88 pages.

This is a study of the group spirit in the light both of history and psychology as seen (1) in human life generally, (2) in the early church, (3) in the mediæval church, with its attempt at the unity of mankind, under such leaders as Gregory the Great for the church and Charlemagne for the state, and (4) the group spirit in church life to-day. These four chapters are introduced by a fine word from the Bishop of Manchester, in which he shows briefly that the trend of to-day is social and spiritual over against individualism and materialism, there being a remarkable growth of corporate life and quickening of social conscience in the last fifty years. In the

survey of the field the author finds both the advantages and disadvantages of the group spirit. "It is the corruption of the best things that causes the worst evils." He traces the group spirit in the early church to its culmination in the episcopacy. Then came the mediæval church with its expansion and those severe and romanic struggles between the church and the state, with which the author expresses more sympathy than with the periods of the Renaissance and the Reformation. In the last chapter he shows that the group life in the spiritual society can never be strong and permanent unless it keeps in touch with its past and that it cannot live and progress without striving forward toward the future. He argues for close connection between the past, present, and future, and finds the factors that serve best to this purpose are literature, public worship, Christian ministry, the leadership of Christ, and the Kingdom of God. The whole book tends to the position that we arrive at the highest and fullest development of group life in which all lesser loyalties are reconciled in loyalties to the universal, and that means to God. It is an interesting argument. The study of the group spirit, to which this is a worth while contribution, is awakening interest among students generally.

THE SOUL OF RELIGION AND OTHER ADDRESSES. By John J. Castleberry, B.D., D.D., Minister of the Walnut Hills Christian Church, Cincinnati, Ohio. Introduction by Edgar DeWitt Jones, D.D., Minister Central Woodward Christian Church, Detroit. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company; 192 pages, $1.50.

The title of this book is attractive and the fifteen sermons are not disappointing to the title. Some of them are "The Power of Thought," "The Ministry of Mysticism," "Knowing God," "The Atonement," "The Three Graces," "Religion and the New Age," "A Nation at the Altar," and "The Heart Path to Unity." This last sermon recognizes the sin of division in the Church, finds the basis of unity, not in compromise, not in reversion to the past, and not in intellectual uniformity; but, by biological processes and spiritual cohesions, a universal basis can be realized in Jesus Christ, who is "the glorious and wholly satisfying summary of all our faith and hopes and dreams." To that end we must think, feel, and practice unity. Every sermon in the book is strong, healthy, and spiritual. Dr. Castleberry has given us an example of a fine quality in preaching.

Organizations for the Promotion of Christian Unity

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF CHRISTIAN UNITY, Inc. Having its inception in the Work of Thomas Campbell, a Presbyterian Minister of Washington, Pa., 1809; present organization, 1910. President, Rev. Levi G. Batman, Youngstown, Ohio; Secretary, Rev. H. C. Armstrong, 230 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore, Md., U.S.A. For intercessory prayer, friendly conferences, and distribution of irenic literature—"till we all attain unto the unity of the faith." Pentecost Sunday is the day named for special prayers for, and sermons on, Christian Unity in all Churches.

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF THE UNITY OF CHRISTENDOM, 1857. President, Athelstan Riley, Esq., 2 Kensington Court, London; Secretary in the United States, Rev. Calbraith Bourn Perry, Cambridge, N. Y. For intercessory prayer for the reunion of the Roman Catholic, Greek, and Anglican Communions.

CHRISTIAN UNITY ASSOCIATION OF SCOTLAND, 1903, Secretary, Rev. Robert W. Weir, Edinburgh. For maintaining, fostering, and expressing the consciousness of the underlying unity that is shared by many members of the different Churches in Scotland.

CHRISTIAN UNITY FOUNDATION, 1910. President, Rev. Nehemiah Boynton; Secretary, Rev. Linley V. Gordon, 70 Fifth Ave., New York City. For the promotion of Christian Unity throughout the world by research and conference.

CHURCHMAN'S UNION, 1898. President, Prof. Percy Gardner; Secretary, Rev. John H. Bentley, Souldern Rectory, Banbury, England. For cultivation of friendly relations between the Church of England and all other Christian Communions.

CONTINUATION COMMITTEE OF THE WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER, 1910. Chairman, Rt. Rev. Charles H. Brent; Secretariat, P. O. Box 226, Boston, Mass, U. S. A. For a world conference of all Christians relative to the unity of Christendom.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON ORGANIC UNION, 1918. Ad Interim Committee— Chairman, Rev. Joseph A. Vance, Detroit, Mich.; Secretary, Rev. Rufus W. Miller, Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia. For the organic union of the Evangelical Churches in the United States of America.

FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA, 1908. President, Dr. S. Parkes Cadman; Secretary, Rev. Charles S. Macfarland, 105 E. 22nd St., New York. For the co-operation of the various Protestant Communions in service, rather than an attempt to unite upon definitions of theology and polity.

FREE CHURCH FELLOWSHIP, 1911. Rev. Malcolm Spencer, Bryn Melyn, Harrow Weald, Middlesex. For the cultivation of corporate prayer and thought for a new spiritual fellowship and communion with all branches of the Christian Church.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE EVANGELICAL FREE CRURCHES OF ENGLAND, 1895. President, Rev. H. Elvet Lewis, M. A., 37 Highbury, New Park, N. 5, London. Secretary, Rev. Thomas Nightingale, Memorial Hall, Farringdon Street, E. C. 4, London. For facilitating fraternal intercourse and co-operation among the Evangelical Free Churches in England.

UNIVERSAL CHRISTIAN CONFERENCE ON LIFE AND WORK, 1920. Chairmen, Archbishop of Upsala, Archbishop of Canterbury, Patriarch of Constantinople, and Rev. A. J Brown; Secretary, Rev. Henry A. Atkinson, 70 Fifth Ave., New York City. For union of the Churches in common, practical work, and to insist that the principles of the Gospel be applied to the solution of contemporary social and international problems.

WORLD ALLIANCE FOR PROMOTING INTERNATIONAL FRIENDSHIP THROUGH THE CHURCHES, 1914. Chairman, Most Rev. Randall Thomas Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury; Hon. Secretary, Rt. Hon. Sir Willoughby H. Dickinson, 41 Parliament St., London, S. W. 1; Chairman, American Council, Rev. William P. Merrill; General Secretary Rev. Henry A. Atkinson, 70 Fifth Ave., New York City. For joint endeavour to achieve the promotion of international friendship through the Churches and the avoidance of war.

WORLD'S EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE, 1846; Incorporated 1912. Chairman, Sir Andrew Wingate; General Secretary, Henry Martyn Gooch, 19 Russell Sqr., London, W. C. 1. To enable Christians of British and foreign nations to realize in themselves, and to manifest to others, that living and essential union which binds together all believers in the fellowship of Christ. Universal Week of prayer organized by the Alliance since 1846.

PRINTED IN UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY THE
HESS PRINTING COMPANY
BALTIMORE, MD.

)L. XVI. No. 4 APRIL, 1927

"God gave unto us the Ministry of Reconciliation"

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

INTERDENOMINATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL

CONTENTS

The Editor's Notes:
Christian Unity and Education—The World Conference on Faith and Order

The Problem of Christian Unity in China . . . . HENRY T. HODGKIN

Week-Day Instruction and Religious Unity . . . JOHN R. SCOTFORD

Report on Christian Unity. 1926 . . . . . ROCKLAND T. HOMANS

Christian Unity—The Ideal of Youth for the Church . . . . . WALTER W. VAN KIRK

Can the Bible Be the Basis of Christian Union? . . . W. J. LHAMON

What People and Papers Are Saying About Unity
The Monks of Unity—Motion of Protestant Groups Toward Unity Pleasing to Roman Catholics—Should We Be Afraid of Lausanne?—Main Purpose of the World Conference—The National Christian Council of China—Unity Conference in Cairo—Christian Council of India, Burma, and Ceylon—Reflections on Reunion—The Baptists and Church Union—There Must Be a Better Way—As a Jew Sees it—Local Church Co-operation—Faith and Order—Need of Mutual Education—Unity as a Missionary End—A Joint Statement on Interchurch Relations from the Commissions of the Congregational and Universalist Churches

Book Reviews
United Churches—Can the Churches Unite?—Youth and Christian Unity—The Spirit of Christ—An Integrated Program of Religious Education, etc.

Contents of Volume XVI

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY, Inc.
230 N. FULTON AVE., BALTIMORE, MD., U. S. A.

AGENTS:
Fleming H. Revell Company, New York
Maruzen Company, Ltd., Tokyo, Osaka, Kyoto, Fukuoka and Sendai

CONTENTS

APRIL, 1927

VOL. XVI. No. 4.

THE EDITOR'S NOTES 341

THE PROBLEM OF CHRISTIAN UNITY IN CHINA ..... HENRY T. HODGKIN 345

WEEK-DAY INSTRUCTION AND RELIGIOUS UNITY ..... JOHN R. SCOTFORD 357

REPORT ON CHRISTIAN UNITY. 1926 ..... ROCKLAND T. HOMANS 361

CHRISTIAN UNITY — THE IDEAL OF YOUTH FOR THE CHURCH ..... WALTER W. VAN KIRK 367

CAN THE BIBLE BE THE BASIS OF CHRISTIAN UNION? ..... W. J. LHAMON 380

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY 395

BOOK REVIEWS 434

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XVI 439

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

230 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore, Md., U.S.A.

CONTRIBUTED ARTICLES:—THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY is open to contributions from all Christians—Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Protestant, and all other Christians who accept Jesus as Lord and Saviour. It is entirely immaterial whether these contributions agree or disagree with the Editor's position, or the position of any contributor. We are seeking to bring together those who differ, for unless we frankly face our differences, and think them through, we shall never agree. THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY welcomes to its Forum all Ministers of Reconciliation.

PRICE:—The price of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY, published in January, April, July, and October, is seventy-five cents a single copy, or two dollars and fifty cents a year, in the United States and all parts of the world. A local church of any communion contributing annually $5.00 or more to THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY EXTENSION FUND will be entitled to receive two copies of THE QUARTERLY free for one year—one copy going to the minister and the other copy to some designated person or institution.

Entered as second-class matter October 18th, 1923, at the Post Office at Baltimore, Md., U.S.A., under the Act of Congress of March 3rd, 1879.

A Statement

THIS journal is the organ of no party other than those, growing up in all parties, who are interested in the Unity of the Church of Christ. Its pages are free to all indications of Christian Unity and Ventures of Faith. It maintains that, whether so accepted or not, all Christians—Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Protestant, and all others who accept Jesus as Lord and Saviour—are parts of the Church of Christ and that their Equality before God is the paramount issue of modern times.

Such a journal must, necessarily, be unofficial in its attempt to be an Interpreter of the mind of the churches and in furnishing a Forum for better understanding and cordial appreciation between the divided, and sometimes far isolated, communions of Christendom. It, thereby, seeks to contribute something to clear the way to the Altar of Reconciliation.

It does not hold itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors, except in a very general way as to their character and general attitude; but it invites to its pages such contributions of thought as will, on one hand, help in the removal of misunderstandings, and, on the other, create an atmosphere where our differences may be frankly faced and freely discussed in Christian Fellowship.

All contributors are allowed the same freedom in the expression of their thoughts, as the Editor exercises for himself. He does not anticipate that others will always approve his thoughts, any more than he presumes to assume responsibility for the thoughts of others; but every writer is responsible for what appears above his own name. We are to be free to think and equally free to let think, until, in corporate thinking and corporate praying, we find the Road to Brotherhood.

Consequently, this journal is not only not the organ of any party in Christendom; but, likewise, it is not the exponent of any theory of Christian Unity. It follows the reality in personal experience of spiritual growth in Christ—growing up in Him and toward other Christians as we find the Truth, which shall free us from suspicion, prejudice, pride, and unlove. Then we shall be able to interpret Christ in those terms which He expressed in his own words,—"By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have Love one to another."

The Christian Union Quarterly

Edited by Peter Ainslie, D. D.

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

Dr. Hamilcar Alivisatos,
Athens, Greece.

Bishop Charles P. Anderson,
Chicago, Ill.

Rev. Nehemiah Boynton, D.D.,
New York, N. Y.

Bishop Charles H. Brent,
Buffalo, N. Y.

Dean Charles R. Brown,
New Haven, Conn.

Prof. William Adams Brown,
New York, N. Y.

Rev. Raymond Calkins, D.D.,
Cambridge, Mass.

Bishop James Cannon, Jr.,
Washington, D. C.

Prof. Dr. J. Eugene Choisy,
Geneva, Switzerland.

Rev. S. D. Chown, D.D.,
Toronto, Canada.

Dr. Francis E. Clark,
Boston, Mass.

Dr. J. A. Cramer,
Utrecht, Holland.

Prof. Dr. Adolf Deissmann,
Berlin, Germany.

Rev. A. W. Fortune, D.D.,
Lexington, Kentucky

Dean H. E. W. Fosbroke,
New York, N. Y.

Dean W. E. Garrison,
Chicago, Ill.

Principal Alfred E. Garvie,
London, England.

Most Rev. Metropolitan Germanos,
Thyatira, Asia Minor.

President W. A. Harper,
Elon College, N. C.

Dr. Henry T. Hodgkin,
Shanghai, China.

Rev. Finis S. Idleman, D.D.,
New York, N. Y.

Dean W. R. Inge,
London, England.

Prof. Rufus M. Jones,
Haverford, Pa.

Bishop Edwin S. Lines,
Newark, N. J.

Dr. Frederick Lynch,
New York, N. Y.

Very Rev. J. A. M'Clymont, D.D.,
Edinburgh, Scotland.

Prof. Samuel McComb,
Cambridge, Mass.

Bishop Francis J. McConnell,
Pittsburgh, Pa.

Bishop William F. McDowell,
Washington, D. C.

The Bishop of Manchester,
Manchester, England.

Rev. William P. Merrill, D.D.,
New York, N. Y.

Dr. Wilfred Monod,
Paris, France.

Dr. C. C. Morrison,
Chicago, Ill.

Dr. John R. Mott,
New York, N. Y.

Bishop Harald Ostenfeld,
Copenhagen, Denmark.

Bishop Edward L. Parsons,
San Francisco, Calif.

Prof. Arthur S. Peake,
Manchester, England.

President George W. Richards,
Lancaster, Pa.

Principal W. B. Selbie,
Oxford, England.

Rev. J. H. Shakespeare, D.D.,
London, England.

Pastor Dr. Friedrich Siegmund-Schultze,
Berlin, Germany.

Dr. Robert E. Speer,
New York, N. Y.

The Archbishop of Upsala,
Upsala, Sweden.

Dr. Henry van Dyke,
Princeton, N. J.

Rev. Joseph A. Vance, D.D.,
Detroit, Mich.

Bishop Boyd Vincent,
Cincinnati, Ohio.

Bishop Luther B. Wilson,
New York, N. Y.

Next Steps to be Taken in Japan

In speaking about Christianity to those who are non-Christians, I have often been faced with the fact that even in Christianity there are many different denominations. Buddhism has also its different denominations, namely Shinshu, Zenshu, Nichiren, etc., while in Christianity we have Congregational, Methodist, Presbyterian, etc., as well. To my chagrin I have felt it necessary to explain about the different denominations to enquirers. At least ten years have passed since I first felt the hindrance this problem is to teaching the Gospel. For what reasons is it necessary for us to have so many denominations of Christian churches in Japan? I think it has not been due to special reasons or circumstances, but simply to the fact that foreign missionaries have brought and planted their own Christianity as it is in their home lands. Now that I have come to understand that this fact is the result of a lack of careful attention, I feel very sorry and cannot understand such carelessness in our seniors. On the other hand, it is true there were some people in the past who endeavored to unite all the denominations, but their effort was a failure in consequence of the trend of the times, till at the present day we have a condition of disunion, opposition, and competition.

—Daikichiro Tagawa.

In *The Japan Christian Quarterly*, Tokyo.

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

APRIL, 1927

THE EDITOR'S NOTES

Christian Unity and Education

THE Church cannot disentangle itself from denominationalism except by a definite educational programme. So long as denominational schools exist with denominational control their output will contribute to the strengthening of denominationalism. And, in turn, the denomination helps to build up the denominational school. Under our present system that process is a definite hindrance to the growth of Christian unity.

There are, of course, all grades of denominational schools, all the way from the severely denominational to that which is hardly denominational at all in its conduct, which gives colour to our hope in the dawning of the day when Christian education shall be entirely disentangled from denominationalism. There are hundreds of schools struggling to that end. In the pathway of many are grave obstacles, which will require tact, patience, time, and Christian statesmanship, but most educators are deeply interested in its accomplishment and some are throwing themselves whole-heartedly into the struggle.

An announcement comes from Belgium that the new Roman Catholic Archbishop of Malines, Monsignor E. J. van Hoey, the successor of the Roman Catholic prophet of unity, the late Cardinal Mercier, has arranged for a course of lectures in the University of Louvain dealing with an understanding among the churches by having representatives of the Eastern Orthodox, Anglican, Swedish, and Protestant Churches to interpret their theological positions to the students of the seminary. A single generation of theological students, with such an advantage in understanding, would change the thought of the whole Church. The same principle is involved in world peace. A chair of peace "to promote peace at home and abroad"

has been established at Kiel University, Germany, and the first incumbent is Dr. Walter Schücking, a judge of the Hague Court and one of the world's greatest authorities on international law.

These methods are footprints in the march of civilization. They are the evidences of definite advances. The nations have studied war so long and the churches their denominationalism that both have been looked upon as necessities, when, as a matter of fact, both are hindrances to the progress of morals and religion and, consequently, have been the factors in holding back civilization from the fulfilment of its ideals.

Nothing would so deepen the interest in friendly attitudes between the nations as chairs of peace in the great universities of the world and nothing would do more to promote understanding between the churches and quicken the unity of Christendom as permanent lectureships in theological seminaries where the various communions could present at first hand their positions as to their theological differences, followed by a course on Christian unity by several from as many communions, with emphasis on our common religious heritages.

Understanding among the churches is the greatest necessity in our Christian world. Writing books, making speeches, and publishing magazines in this interest are helpful factors, but beginning in our universities with definite programmes of peace and beginning in our denominational colleges with equally definite programmes for understanding among Christians would be a permanent approach for the healing of the sore of bigotry and hate. Here is where education has its greatest contribution to make for a better world in the advancement of a higher civilization. Are our educational institutions prophetic enough to make the overture?

The World Conference on Faith and Order

There are differences in the Church. Many of these differences appear so great that vast chasms extend through the history of Christianity, making an ugly picture of that which ought to have been beautiful. The World Conference on Faith

and Order is dealing directly with these differences. A desire is rising in all parts of Christendom for an adjustment. While the Roman Catholics have not entered officially into the work of the World Conference, they are sympathetic toward it and, by the organization of the Order of Monks of Unity, they are showing their interest in the great problem of a united Christendom. While a majority of Christendom will be represented at Lausanne this summer, the minority cannot be thought of as out of thought in the issues that will arise there around the conference table of Anglicans, Eastern Orthodox, and Protestants.

We are coming to understand that differences are not in themselves hindrances to adjustment. We have thought so and, consequently, "uniformity" was a common word in our approaches to this problem; whereas uniformity would no more add to the strength and beauty of the Church than it would to the garden or forest. It would deaden Christianity as it would a garden of flowers. We want variety and variety as widely different as the personalities of mankind, but we want adjustment, so that our differences will suit to our needs and tastes and experiences without conflict. When we have abandoned the idea of uniformity, which is thoroughly unscientific, and have sought to find adjustment of differences with tolerance and appreciation and love, new paths will open which will lead us into the reality of a united Christendom.

The creeds and the priesthood are questions that concern the Church. The World Conference is dealing with these questions. In the eighty-odd communions represented there is a wide variety of interpretation — from the Friends to the Eastern Orthodox; but, so long as Christ is held to the center, tolerance and appreciation and love will find outlets for new interpretations. It is the time of discoveries. Lausanne will make a contribution to the finding of new paths. The Lord's servants will be there and the Lord's Spirit will clothe afresh those who put themselves in the way.

It is a time for prayer. Those who go and those who are not expecting to go can kneel about a common altar for

the wisdom and the mercy of God to be upon his peoples and for his Spirit to bear witness in the assembly of those from all parts of the earth and from nearly all the communions of Christendom who shall sit together in meekness and humility for guidance toward adjustment of our theological differences as a factor in the unity of Christendom.

The words of Bishop Nicolai of Serbia come to mind here: "To be able to speak with one voice, all the church leaders must awaken to the apocalyptic earnestness of the present time, and must feel like soldiers in different uniforms, but of the same army, marching toward the same goal. All other aims, like increase in welfare of one's own denomination, getting money for new buildings, proselytizing in the church of one's neighbours, sending missions to handfuls of people in the dark corners of the globe — all these ends are trifling games of the blind who do not see their main duty in a night of earthquake. If necessary, therefore, let my denomination perish, but let Christ be the ruler of the rulers of the world . . . The voices of many churches are no voice at all. One united voice of all the churches will shake the earth."

O Lord, we thank Thee for thy patience with us in the midst of our divisions and a waiting world. Hasten the day when we all shall see the truth as it is in Jesus, and increase in us that true loyalty to Thee which shall bind us to all who are in thy fellowship. Forgive our self-will and teach us how to make every day a time for the offering up of ourselves unto Thee with pure affection and hearty devotion. Lead us by the shadow of the cross until there shall be fulfilled in us all thy gracious promises. In finding Thee we have found the fellowship that is to break all fellowships until there shall be one flock, whose fellowship shall never be broken, under the lead of the one Shepherd, to whom be glory for ever. *Amen.*

PETER AINSLIE.

THE PROBLEM OF CHRISTIAN UNITY IN CHINA

BY HENRY T. HODGKIN, D.D.
Secretary of the National Christian Council of China, Shanghai, China

FEW situations are calculated to make the follower of Christ think more furiously than that of the Protestant churches in China striving to express their sense of their oneness in Christ. On the one hand, you see a nation which is struggling toward political unity. Thwarted by the self-seeking of ambitious generals, by the veniality of many officials, by the intrigues of certain foreign powers; rendered almost impotent by so large a proportion of illiterates, differences of provincial interests and ideals, lack of high-minded leadership; almost in despair as one hope after another has proved illusory; nevertheless, one cannot fail to detect the passionate desire of the people of China for a national unity and stability which may give a chance for her to develop her immense resources and deal with her many internal problems. For half a generation China has been passing from crisis to crisis. Misled again and again, pathetically trusting to the fair promises of each new leader, looking always to new quarters for the long-delayed salvation, you have a people ready, not to say eager, to catch any sight of a movement which shows coherence, direction, honesty, courage. Could there be a nation more obviously prepared for the message of the undivided Church of the Living Christ? She has been passing through a wilderness of plots and counterplots. Each apparent oasis has proved a mirage. Who shall offer to her water—living water—and lead her out of the bleak wastes into the green pastures? A Christian Church which showed power and passion, where the leadership was united and self-forgetful, where the rank and file were loyal and free, where truth and righteousness and peace

reigned supreme—such a Church could give to China to-day precisely what she most of all wants.

Let us, on the other hand, look at the Christian forces in China and sincerely face the facts. In the first place, we see the ancient divisions between Roman Catholic and Protestant, not less sharply marked than in any other country. In fact, in some ways the difference is accentuated. There are different Chinese terms in use for the same thing. One is the religion of Heaven's Lord, the other the religion of Jesus. In many centers the propaganda leads to definite opposition. Villages where both "religions" are represented may be rent by old quarrels, the families on the one side adhering to "Heaven's Lord," on the other side, to "Jesus." Law suits which have been long protracted come into the field of this religious division and, in the past, there have been many cases where those engaged in them have gained, or hoped to gain, influence or success by adherence to one religious system or the other. Very little intercourse between the leaders is found possible. Even in great moral crusades, such as anti-opium, there is a minimum of co-operation. Who could guess that these two groups were parts of one army seeking to win China to faith in one Lord and Saviour?

With any lack of coherence in the Roman Catholic ranks we have here no concern. In Protestantism there is surely failure enough to give us anxious thought. Through about one hundred and thirty different societies has this type of Christianity found its way into China. Some of these represent the same system of thought and church government. But there are a number of groups very widely different in these respects —Anglican, Methodist, Lutheran, Baptist, Presbyterian, Congregational, Quaker, Seventh-Day Adventist, and so forth. There are further a number of quite small groups which cut themselves off from all others and preach a religious exclusiveness which seems poles apart from the spirit of the Master. It is happily true that there are movements toward union, some of which have gone a long way. It is also true that some of the different elements within certain general groups are now in

very close relationship, or even form a single national organization for the group. These groupings may be looked upon as hopeful signs in a very difficult situation. They do little, however, to relieve the strain upon the consciences of thoughtful Chinese Christians. They fall very far short of providing that kind of church which a divided and distracted China supremely needs. Although there is much good-will between missionary leaders in these various groups, although most are uniting in certain common tasks and are linked with one another in a National Christian Council, one cannot escape the reflection that many of them *seem* to care more for the perpetuation of a denominational organization and viewpoint than for the demonstration of that unity for which Christ prayed and for want of which China is dying. Most of these same leaders would most strenuously and quite sincerely deny any such suggestion; but acts have a way of speaking louder than words, and what every one in China sees is that these divisions are here and that they are maintained by the foreign organizations which have introduced them. They cannot fairly be called a part of that indigenous Christianity we are all talking about.

Into the midst of this already turbulent sea of contending parties there has recently been thrown yet another apple of discord. Certain Western countries are being torn by a controversy which cuts across all the old sectarian frontiers and this controversy is coming to China. Here we have a church struggling to find itself, facing the many perplexing problems of applying Christianity to the intricate and changing life of China, wondering how it can relate this new message to all that is noble and of enduring value in China's past, handicapped already by all these denominational outlooks and forms, striving to get rid of the merely foreign in this wonderful new faith. And we—we who came here to bring this great good gift—force upon the infant Church a decision which she does not want or need to face, and which she is by no means prepared to consider in all its bearings. There are many who are demanding that these young Christians shall at once declare themselves modernist or fundamentalist, and who will brook no

delay in giving an answer. Surely this is a refinement of spiritual cruelty. Already the Church is laden beyond endurance by our unhappy divisions, and here comes another fraught with infinite consequences and arousing an amazing amount of heat whenever it is raised. Again one asks, What right have we to create this difficulty? Those who raise the issue honestly believe, in most cases, that they are serving God in doing so. They see the honour of Christ or the cause of truth at stake. We need not impugn motives. But one cannot excuse, even on the ground of good motive, a policy which forces upon the young churches of China a choice which they are unprepared to make on an issue they would never have raised if left to themselves. The result of all this is that Chinese Christianity is divided and torn and, therefore, comparatively ineffective just at the moment when unity and direction are supremely needed.

This Church longs passionately for unity. Four years ago Chinese Christians, men and women, from all parts of China, co-operated in producing a message to the Chinese people. That message is a production of Chinese Christian thought on a national scale in a sense that is true of nothing else which has been uttered in China. The first note it strikes is the assertion of unity. Why? Because to the onlooker the first impression of this Chinese Christianity is exactly the reverse. They know that there is a degree of unity very different from the appearance. They know that their witness is very seriously weakened because of this appearance of division, which is a part of the Western garb they cannot help wearing. The first thing they felt it essential to do was to try to tear away this appearance and assert the inner fact. Yet, when all is said and done, how few listen to the protest and how many observe the thing against which the protest is made!

It is not enough for us to explain the historical situation which has brought this state of things into existence and rendered it well-nigh inevitable. We are facing a fact very stubborn indeed, yet one which no large-minded Christian dare acquiesce in. It may be a mountain, but what about the faith which can remove mountains? Are we to confess ourselves

powerless before a hindrance to the cause of Christ, so considerable, and actually raised by the Christian forces themselves? Certainly there are strong tendencies combining to perpetuate this anomaly or to render it amazingly difficult of removal. There is the power of an ancient tradition, the sheer momentum of a great body which has for generations been moving in a certain orbit. To swing it into another is hard indeed. There is an immense amount of money, which is still sorely needed to keep the whole Christian movement in China going, and which comes from denominational sources, implicitly, if not explicitly, directed to maintain sectarianism in China. The machine of mission and church is geared to go at a certain pace and is planned for a certain type of work. To speed up the pace toward unity, to turn the machine toward a goal different from that of extending the particular ecclesiastical groups which have started the machine going, is no light task. There are habits of thought which make it very hard for many of the leaders to think of the Kingdom of God in China in any other terms than those of their particular communion. It is an ill day for any of us when we identify that Kingdom in all its richness and variety with our own group or society or methods; yet that is what many of us have come to do. We cannot think of it in any other way.

A year or two ago I had the privilege of meeting a group of Chinese Christians deeply concerned about these questions. What was to be their line of action in face of these facts? They were divided as to the desirability of a creed for the church in China, but they were at one in believing that the time had not yet come to formulate or adopt any creed. When a creed came to be adopted, if at all, they felt it must be worked out by Chinese who were seeking to express their own experience of the eternal verities and who would express them in ways more congenial to Chinese thought than anything we can impart from the West. They clearly felt it might be several generations before agreement on even a simple statement of faith could be attained, just because they are now so largely the pensioners on Western thought. Further, they questioned many of our

practices in church life. They were by no means convinced that the one-man, paid ministry, methods of worship, the sacraments, and other things which most Western Christians take for granted, are to take their place as integral parts of the Christian life of China. They were not by any means agreed in any desire to change or abandon such practices; they simply felt that the time had not come to decide and they did not wish to be rushed into a decision.

These people belonged to several different branches of the Christian Church; Anglican, Congregational, Presbyterian, Methodist, at any rate, were represented. Each one had a contribution to make. They were men and women of genuine Christian experience who were making large sacrifices for their faith. They were talking their hearts out in my presence. I saw through them something of the agony of the upspringing Christian life of China. It came to one freshly what a very big thing is happening in China. In the early days of our faith Hebrew thought and religious experience baptized into the new spirit of Christ came into contact with Greek philosophy and the Roman system. That terrific conflict of thought has left its mark for all time upon Christian theology and upon our ecclesiastical life. From it emerged a church closely knit together, deeply imbued with the Roman idea of law, expressing itself on the deepest mysteries in a largely Greek form, and carrying the stern moral tradition of Judaism into the world of that day.

Until the last century the Christian faith can scarcely be said to have come up against any other great system of thought. It has met and conquered people of vigorous life who have made their varied contributions to the ever widening streams of Christian experience. But only now is a real clash of thought again taking place, and it would be absurd to suppose that there will not be profound modifications. What right have we to expect that the ways of expressing eternal truth will be the same for China as for the church that framed the Nicene creed? What is eternal in that creed must live, for truth will not die. But China has her own rights as she seeks to enter the Christian family—and one right is to speak her own language.

It is, then, in the situation I have tried to indicate that we have to think deeply and freshly on the problem of Christian unity. I sometimes feel that I have been partner to a crime unwittingly committed in this land, into which we wish to bring Christ in all his power and beauty. In spite of our desires, we have brought Him bound and marred. He is seen through our unchristian civilization, through our imperfect theologies, through our divided Church, through our sinning selves, not in the splendour of his conquering Love. How can we deal with a situation which has developed without any one designing it or desiring it, but which, nevertheless, is created by the very persons and organizations which have brought the Christian Gospel to China?

Attempts are now being made in several different ways and it may be well to glance at them one by one.

1. *National Denominational Groupings.* This plan may be said to be the easiest and most obvious. By some it is regarded simply as a step toward a more inclusive union; others lay chief emphasis upon the fact that such national groups are linked with a larger body in which many nations are represented, thus emphasizing the universal character of the Christian religion. To be specific, a Chinese Methodist Church may be thought of as a step toward a united Chinese Church in which Methodism, having unity within its own ranks, can more readily take up the question of uniting with Anglican or Presbyterian groups, or it may be thought of as the national unit in a World Methodism which stands for certain aspects of Christian truth the world over and unites those who share a certain experience and are committed to a certain programme, whatever their race or colour. From the point of view of the unity in the Chinese Church there is clearly a great difference here, although the first step of uniting the various groups in China which have a similar basis and polity would be identical, whichever goal were in sight. At present the strongest push in China would seem to be in the direction of such denominational groupings. This fact was recognized by the National Christian Conference when it based the Council it created upon denomi-

national units, all Lutherans, Presbyterians, Anglicans, etc., being grouped together even where no national organic unity had yet been achieved. Moreover, this plan is one which raises fewest financial problems. Funds come through denominational sources and are to some extent dependent upon denominational loyalty. To group denominationally raises few questions for the giver and the body through which the gift is administered. The support of any organization resting on such units is a relatively simple thing, and thus one may, at least, claim for this plan that it is the path of least resistance. It may also be that it is actually the best path, but our judgment in this would depend in part, at least, upon a prior judgment as to whether or not the principles or points of view around which we are grouped denominationally correspond to differences of the human mind and temperament to be found always and everywhere. If it is true that there are, in every nation, those to whom an Anglican form of worship will make a special appeal and others who would be reached more by, let us say, a Salvation Army meeting, and, if these differences cannot but throw us into different groups, then we may assume that these denominational groupings constitute the right and proper line of development. If, on the other hand, we hold that these and other differences ought not to divide us permanently into denominational families, we may be inclined to question whether this line of development marks a true advance, however inevitable it may seem to be.

2. *Interdenominational Grouping on a National Scale.* One considerable experiment of this kind is now being carried through, the bodies concerned being the Presbyterian and Congregational. The new Chinese Church which has been formed shows signs of life and is giving a place to Chinese leadership and initiative which is certainly hopeful. In South Fukien all the Christian forces have been for some years united in a single church where these two polities alone are represented. The union recently established in Canada will, presumably, bring into this Chinese Church a large Methodist element in West China. We may thus see the working out in China and under

the conditions of a great mission-field a unity which is much more than a denominational one. Some of the groups under the two chief polities concerned may not combine. It remains to be seen whether Chinese leadership in this new group will indicate ways whereby a larger unity may be attained, whether in fact the tendency of such grouping will be to make higher the walls which separate such a group from the Baptists, on the one hand, or the Anglicans, on the other, or whether new doors will be opened that would make a discussion of unity with the national denominational groups more hopeful than in the home lands. Certainly the promoters of this scheme are eager to see as many as possible united by it in an effective working unity. But we are still, even through this plan, a long way from solving the more difficult problems of church unity.

3. *The Independent Church Movement.* In various parts of China independent churches have been established, usually with the good-will of the missionaries. Some of these are at present carrying on their work as isolated congregations, or groups of congregations locally united. There is, nevertheless, some evidence of a desire to create out of this Independent Church Movement a distinctive Chinese Church, having as little as possible of foreign flavour and wholly independent of foreign funds. No doubt the Chinese who have been leaders in this movement have thought, in many cases, in terms of a united as well as a more thoroughly Chinese Church organization. It can hardly be said, however, that, apart from the union of churches referred to under the previous heading, there is any sufficient strength in this movement to lead us to look to it for an ultimate solution of the problem.

4. *Local Federations.* There seems to be some evidence of a desire on the part of certain Chinese Christians to find a way of solving the problem along lines somewhat different from any of these. In certain large cities the leaders of the Protestant Christian forces have discovered what it means to work together and they have seen the great advantage of local federation of churches in tackling great social problems, in special efforts of evangelism, in meeting special emergencies. These federations

do not carry with them the idea of intercommunion and they are in only a few instances more than tentative first experiments. Nevertheless, they have opened up a new possibility, and it may be said that this possibility makes a peculiar appeal to Chinese. Here friendship is felt to be one of the most vital elements, if not the most vital, in any social grouping. We often assume that a definition of the principles on which we are agreed is essential to any organic union of Christians. To the Chinese mind the question would naturally arise as to whether the understanding which arises among friends, which seeks no definition and often baffles such, may not be an even more important factor. In these local federations, as a rule, no attempt is made to agree on terms of unity. Men accept one another because they know one another. They see evidence in life of the reality of the desire to follow Christ and that is felt to be enough for common work. How much, if any, more do we really need? Such may be said to the point of view of many earnest Chinese Christians who are seeking unity in this way. It certainly raises a far-reaching issue.

Enough, perhaps, has been said to show that the problem of church unity is not necessarily to be solved in China on lines identical with those which seem most hopeful or least difficult in other lands. In the first place, we have to appreciate the urgency of the problem here and the peculiar force with which it presses on Chinese Christians. To them it can scarcely seem less than an outrage that that which has the capacity to produce so deep a unification is shorn of this distinctive power by those who bring it to China. In the second place, there is a growing distrust of the whole institutional side of religion and this is reflected in a doubt as to the value of combinations to make a more impressive and authoritative institution. Is such an arrangement, thoughtful Chinese would ask, an essentially Christian thing at all? Thirdly, there is a demand, ever increasing for a fuller expression of Chinese thought and practical genius in the Christian movement. The grouping of organizations which owe their distinctions from one another to extra-Chinese influences, and which are all operating on lines

which have originated and been perfected in other environments, seems a quite doubtful procedure. Finally, there is the beginning of a question as to the underlying thought in so much that is being proposed as a solution to these questions. Is it really possible or profitable to build so much upon our, at best, imperfect attempts to define our agreements? May not agreement — as much as we need for all practical purposes — be worked out through friendship, mutual respect, free interchange of thought, genuine search for truth, to a truer end than can ever be reached when we start out on intellectual agreements which have always to be reduced to verbal statements?

What China seems to demand, in fact, is not a formal agreement to certain historical statements, however true and important, or to a certain body of principles deduced from these or arrived at otherwise. She would appear to be feeling out toward a practical fellowship in seeking great ends, truth, service of the community, deeper fellowship, and so forth. Her motto is likely to be that which Dr. Lew announced at the National Christian Conference, "Let us agree to differ and resolve to love," with the addition suggested by another Chinese Christian, "Let us unite to serve."

As one thinks of China's divisions and unsettlement since the break up of the Manchu regime, one cannot but recall what happened in Europe when the power of Rome declined. In that age of confusion one force steadied men's minds, gave hope and coherence and direction to a society staggering under repeated blows, and threatened by terrible internal ills. It was the Christian Church, which had unity and leadership, even though it had many faults. I have no wish to see the type of organization which embodied that unity reproduced in China to-day. There were flaws in the structure which, later, caused its collapse, though not until it had performed a very notable service to Europe and to civilization. Is it possible that there may be a period of political and economic uncertainty and confusion before China and that what she needs above all else is a body which can render such a service? If so, it is an unspeakably

urgent interest of this land that the Church should find herself quickly, should be able to speak the language of the people, and should find a way of demonstrating her unity. If the churches of the West and their representatives should stand in the way of this consummation it would be grievous beyond measure.

Yet this is a real danger, unless we can learn to think freshly and more from the Chinese point of view in regard to this question of Christian unity. I do not pretend to have found the solution. What I hope is that this article may call forth some fresh thinking and may serve to challenge some of those presuppositions which must be re-examined if progress is to be made.

HENRY T. HODGKIN.

O MEN OF GOD!

Rise up, O men of God!
  Have done with lesser things;
Give heart and soul and mind and strength
  To serve the King of kings.

Rise up, O men of God!
  His Kingdom tarries long:
Bring in the day of brotherhood
  And end the night of wrong.

Rise up, O men of God!
  The Church for you doth wait,
Her strength unequal to her task:
  Rise up, and make her great!

Lift high the cross of Christ!
  Tread where his feet have trod:
As brothers of the Son of Man
  Rise up, O men of God!

—*William P. Merrill.*

WEEK-DAY INSTRUCTION AND RELIGIOUS UNITY

BY REV. JOHN R. SCOTFORD

Minister of the Glenville Congregational Church, Cleveland, Ohio

THE movement for week-day religious instruction on school time is one of the most promising developments of present-day church life, not only because of the educational opportunity which it creates, but also for the better understanding between our religious groups which it tends to promote.

Week-day instruction requires co-operation in the most intimate and vital task which the Church performs—the religious instruction of the young. Under our constitution school boards must treat all faiths alike; the privilege of one is the opportunity of all. But if the churches are to enjoy the co-operation of the school board they must first learn to act alike. Church co-operation must precede school co-operation.

The basis of co-operation in our towns and smaller cities differs from that of the great metropolitan conters.

Our towns and smaller cities are overwhelmingly Protestant. Religious divisions are between denominations rather than faiths. Sectarianism has commonly run riot in these communities. Such co-operation as has existed between churches has been brought about by transient spasms of moral reform. Week-day religious instruction, however, implies long continued and consistent co-operation. The waning of divisive denominationalism is shown by the large number of towns and cities in which the churches have been able to present a solid front upon this question. In these communities, when church sentiment is unanimous for week-day instruction, the school boards will practically always grant the request.

Co-operation has rarely ceased with the securing of the privilege of having the children dismissed an hour a week upon request of their parents. To take children who study together

in the public schools and to divide them up into small sectarian groups for religious instruction has seemed both wasteful and silly. The churches have usually pooled their resources of equipment, teaching ability, and money, operating a single system of week-day classes for the entire Protestant constituency. Problems have arisen in this work, but they have concerned administration, pedagogical methods, and finance rather than theology. Nowhere have co-operative week-day classes been wrecked by differing religious views.

In our larger cities the problem of week-day religious instruction is far more complicated.

School boards are less amenable to church influence; they must be convinced that week-day religious instruction is desirable from the educational standpoint. They grant that there is need of moral instruction and religious training, but they are sceptical of the ability of the churches to effectually cope with the problem. From the point of view of administration the request for week-day religious instruction raises many questions. In the larger systems the school principals enjoy great freedom of action. The upper grades are commonly organized on either the "departmental" or the "platoon" systems, both of which entail highly complicated schedules. The teachers are of many types and represent a wide variety of faiths. Week-day instruction cannot be brought to pass by the fiat of school board or superintendent; it must be secured by patiently winning the co-operation of many people of many sorts. In the meantime, school boards insist that the question cannot be given serious consideration until a plan is presented to which the Protestants, Catholics, and Jews subscribe.

Attempts are now being made to bring these three groups together for a program of week-day religious instruction. The problem is for them to get acquainted, to generate mutual confidence and good-will, and then to evolve a plan which will be acceptable to all. This has not yet been done in any major city, but a beginning has been made in a number of places.

Conferences between Protestant, Catholic, and Jew in regard to week-day instruction have led to an interesting dis-

covery—each group faces a more serious and difficult problem than the others had suspected.

The Protestant churches are in a state of painful disillusionment concerning the Sunday-school. The enthusiastic delight of our fathers in this institution has given way to a fast growing suspicion that the problem of religious education cannot be solved by amateur methods. When the Jew suggests that the desire for week-day instruction arises from the failure of the Sunday-school, Protestants wince but make no reply.

The Catholic Church has made a tremendous investment of money and effort in the parochial school in the hope of solving her problem of religious education. No group have made greater sacrifices to provide religious training for their children than the followers of Rome. Yet the increasing cost of building and the demand for a broader and more expensive secular education create for them a tremendous problem. In one city they state that it will require ten years for them to provide buildings for their present parochial school constituency. Necessarily a very large proportion of their children attend the public schools. Most of these children come from the families which are rather loosely bound to the church. The Roman Church would welcome the opportunity to give religious training to this group. If her experience with such an arrangement proved successful, she might be led to consider some modification of her present educational policy.

The Jew already has a week-day school of his own, meeting in the synagogue after school hours. He is proud of the work done in these schools, and sometimes insinuates that the Protestant churches might well go and do likewise. But the Jews are scattering throughout our cities, living further and further from the synagogues and temples. These are organized on a competitive rather than a co-operative basis, and are commonly grouped in one or two central localities. They also differ widely in degree of orthodoxy and in their attitude toward the customs of Israel. This situation limits greatly the attendance at these after school classes. It also renders co-operation in week-day religious instruction difficult. By the time the Jewish children

reached their centers it would be time for them to start back to school again.

The Jew is also suspicious of the week-day movement because it seems to him to point in the direction of a state religion. The activities of the Klan, plus anti-evolution bills, plus the Fundamentalist ambition to put the Bible into the constitution, plus Bible-reading bills in a number of states have made our Jewish friends a bit nervous. They tremble lest our historic separation of church and state be in some measure abridged. The movement for week-day religious instruction looks like a step in that direction. Although far from unanimous in their opposition to this movement, they are frankly suspicious of it.

In our greater cities week-day religious instruction can only be won as mutual understanding and good-will are increased.

School boards must be convinced that the methods used in week-day religious instruction are educationally sound, and that the results secured are worth the disruption of schedule which the plan implies. Only as the work is successfully demonstrated in the smaller cities can there be any hope of its adoption in the larger ones.

The three religious groups must be brought together upon a basis of good-faith and good-will. The Jew must be convinced that there is no desire to foist a system of religion upon the state. Plans for week-day instruction must be worked out cooperatively by Protestant, Catholic, and Jew in such a way as to both safeguard the rights and further the interests of each group.

Those who have followed the movement feel that some form of week-day religious instruction is inevitable. The official representatives of the Protestants, Catholics, and Jews are now engaged in the happy business of getting acquainted with each other about the conference table. A common plan will ultimately be devised. The inevitable by-product of mutual understanding will be immensely valuable. Fellowship together in the common task of religious education will certainly promote an increasing measure of unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.

JOHN R. SCOTFORD.

REPORT ON CHRISTIAN UNITY. 1926

BY ROCKLAND T. HOMANS, D.D.
Rector of Grace Episcopal Church, Jamaica, N. Y.

THE leading social problems of the present day relate to practical methods for increasing good-will, sympathy, and co-operation. We hear much of the perennial disagreements between capital and labour, and the troubles arising from this source have only been aggravated by those who recommend the cultivation of "class-consciousness," so that the oppressed may co-operate effectually against their oppressors.

Another familiar cause of the present day is the promotion of good-will among nations, the arbitration of difficulties between them, and the ultimate abolition of war. Largely for the promotion of this end, the League of Nations was founded. But, while, as we may recognize, such problems are valid problems, we must insist that their permanent solution can never be found in adjustments—no matter how equitable—between the clashing selfish interests of two or more selfish parties. We might even inquire how an association of several selfish people or nations could achieve entire unselfishness in its operations.

On the other hand, perfect unselfishness is an ideal; or, rather, it is more properly a mass characteristic than an individual virtue. It can find realization only when a number of individuals, inspired by a common interest or enthusiasm, co-operate for the common good. This involves recognition of the fact that the solution of the problems of civilization must be moral, rather than economic or sociologic; and to this we must add the corollary, that a moral solution, in order to be effective, must come with the force and authority of religion. In religion alone, among all the forces acting in human society, can we discern an element capable of furnishing a motive for moral, ethical, or other orders of good behaviour. A man may be in-

spired to certain orders of good behaviour by family pride or pure patriotism, but only the object of serving and glorifying God can lend hope of real righteousness. Thus a noted writer on sociology, popular some years since, discerns in religion the function of supplying a "superrational sanction for conduct," but, as a result of wide examination of its influence among all peoples, he finds himself compelled to designate it "the central fact in human history."

We might well hesitate to ascribe a definite utility to the religious instinct of man, or to its numerous manifestations, and, yet, as thoughtful men, we must inquire what may be its proper function in human life, and what its ultimate justification, as against the contentions of those who would discount its validity. If we turn to a study of ancient man, we shall find a general recognition of the fact that the religious practices and institutions of a tribe or nation constitute the one sufficient rallying point for all individuals. It is the ground of their mutual sympathy, the impulse to their common activities, and the guarantee of their individual interests and safety. No man could change his religion, without, also, changing his tribal affiliations. Patriotism and religion were co-extensive—because the tribe was the special care of its god. Hence, doubt was not only impiety, but also disloyalty. In the persistence of sentiments in accord with such principles, we may discern the moving cause of religious persecutions in all ages. But, while we may deplore the methods of the persecutors, we cannot fail to discern the ultimate correctness of the theory basing them. Moral, legal, and religious conformity are essential to social stability of any order, and the act of inaugurating or maintaining opposition to them is a direct contribution to disorder, anarchy, and strife.

All this applies to the subject of Christian unity, which is perhaps the most important of all the movements caused by the general unrest and inefficiency in modern life. It is not too much to claim that on the solution of the problem of Christian unity depends the ultimate solving of almost all others that harass and distress us to-day. For at the very fountain-head of

religious influence, in the division of Christendom into the numerous sects and denominations, each claiming sufficient authority to teach and minister in the name of Christ, we find the most serious barrier to the realization of Christian ideals and the performance of Christian duties.

Sectarian separation acts constantly to limit sympathies and fellowship in life's most vital concerns — religion and morals. In it we behold the sad spectacle of "a house divided against itself," and cannot wonder that a society suffering from such a disability at the roots of its being should manifest other troubles such as are classed as social, economic, and industrial.

We claim, therefore, that the indispensable condition of successful social, or mass, life among mankind is agreement upon standards accepted by all and dominating the motives of all. Such standards need not be unreasonable and arbitrary. They need not restrain human freedom of action by the force of unacceptable laws and meddlesome agencies. We may even agree that they should be founded upon ideas and principles deliberately chosen by the majority. Yet, while making such a verbal concession, we must reflect that the standards accepted by humanity in the past have been willingly, even enthusiastically, accepted, quite as truly as if, in modern fashion, they had been established by popular vote. For, whereas, in olden times, people accepted authority passively and submissively, now they accept precisely similar conditions under the conviction that they are acting voluntarily and without constraint. The results are the same in the end.

In any effort, therefore, to subserve the best interests of our fellowmen, we must take full account of human nature, just as in attempting to build a house, a machine, or any other artificial structure, we must take account of the physical properties of the material of which it is to be composed. Otherwise failure is inevitable. In any social cause we must recognize the patent fact that neither the Gospel, nor any other code of wisdom or righteousness, requires of humanity any duties which are apart from the intentions evidently contemplated by the Creator. Briefly, the commands of Christ or the statutes of

Moses outline only the virtues which we were designed and created to express. Even the brotherly love, which is accepted as the supreme contribution of Christianity to the world's thought, indicates precisely the only indispensible condition of social stability and moral success. It is vital that an efficient influence, making for mutual sympathy and common interest, should exist among people attempting any form of co-operation. To foster such an influence is the highest earthly mission of religion. For, as the Apostle well says, "If one love not his brother whom he hath seen, how shall he love God whom he hath not seen?"

Not only is it inconsistent to preach one God, one Faith, one Baptism from dozens of separated, and still mutually antagonistic centers of Christian profession, but it is also ineffectual and abortive. So long as we hear, as of old, "I am of Paul" —"I am of Apollos,"—just so long will be continued among us defective sympathies, or downright lack of sympathy, faltering and half-hearted co-operation in essential activities, antagonisms, self-sufficiencies, fanaticism, heresy, and doubt. The Gospel to-day fails of its power to save society. The glory of God is concealed among the rival concepts of God and his character, and amid the rivalries and antagonisms of the various schools of precept and practice. These are the conditions which the movement of Christian unity seeks to abolish. It knows well that what the world needs to-day is a unified, co-operating, fraternal Christianity, without emphasis of individual opinions or desire for peculiar practices. And that this end is to be found only in Christian unity is becoming the conviction of increasing numbers of thoughtful people.

With these ideas in mind it is at least encouraging to recount the various movements in the interest of Christian unity that have taken place during the past year. At least some progress has been made, though no definite results can be pointed out. The last letters have been published of Cardinal Mercier written to the Archbishop of Canterbury as the result of "the Malines Conversations." They show to us a fine piece of Christian statesmanship.

The United Church of Canada, after one year of life, shows that it is really united, by its members adapting themselves to changed conditions and adjusting themselves to meet the new problems as they are presented. This movement may be classed as a great spiritual achievement, that will show increasing power as the years go on. It is beginning to manifest, after a year's experience, a national mass-consciousness on a large scale. It is composed of former adherents of the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregational bodies, including most of the membership formerly distributed among these bodies, except a small dissenting remnant of the Presbyterian Church. Though in numbers this separate body may be small, yet in influence and prestige it is very powerful. In the new united body a new life and new interest are being manifested, for it is well established that the minister finds himself not "the voice of the sixteenth century Protestantism, nor the seventeenth century Puritanism, nor the eighteenth century Methodism, with the grave defects of each of these movements,—but rather he speaks as a ministry of a church claiming fellowship with the Christian Church of all ages and nations."

It is interesting to relate the publication of certain negotiations looking toward Church unity, that have been going on in India, under the direction and encouragement of the Anglican Bishop of Bombay. The proposed plan holds that the Christian Church should be so organized "as to make the church in India give the Indian expression of the Spirit, the thought and the life of the Church Universal." The bodies included are the South India United Church, representing the Presbyterian, Congregational, and German Evangelical Missions, which would agree with the Church of England in India, that after a fixed date for union they should leave "all ordinations of ministers in the hands of the episcopate."

We are glad to record the irenic spirit manifested in the Free Churches of Great Britain, which, through the Federal Council, has expressed itself in various conferences whereby the status of the ministry of the Free Churches has been discussed and the nature of the episcopate has been investigated.

In America the subdivisions within the various denominational bodies have been seeking consolidation one with another. The Presbyterian and Reformed Churches are beginning to find it easier to take action looking toward union than ever before, which, through the General Council of the Presbyterian and Reformed Churches in America, have been working in common toward helping the Reformed Churches on the continent of Europe.

This report would be incomplete without at least a reference to the good effect toward a greater unity among Christians, as the result of the work of federation in bringing into co-operation the different churches in active service, and also that of the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work at Stockholm in 1925 in emphasizing the ethical interpretation of Christianity.

The last reference, but by no means the least in importance, is to the greater interest that has been shown by the various communions in the coming World Conference on Faith and Order to be held in Lausanne, August 2 to 21, 1927. The Continuation Committee of the World Conference on Faith and Order met at Berne, this past summer (August 23 to 25, 1926). It was a representative body assembled, and the meeting was another step in advance in this great adventure of idealism.

One interesting feature during the past year has been an increased number of articles in the public press and magazines on the subject of Christian unity, and the interest in and demands for, the different series have been significant of the importance of the subject in the public mind.

In conclusion, two thoughts on the subject of unity present themselves—(1) our religious divisions, as at present existing, obscure the truth as it is in Jesus Christ, and (2) a divided Church is a denial of Christianity as a vital force. The question to be asked is, What is to be done next?—How shall we advance the work of extending human sympathy, fellow-feeling, and co-operation, so as to include all humanity in an effectual, practical, working unity—an army under one commander, an organism with one seat of life?

ROCKLAND T. HOMANS.

CHRISTIAN UNITY--- THE IDEAL OF YOUTH FOR THE CHURCH*

BY REV. WALTER W. VAN KIRK

Secretary of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, New York

YOUTH is helping to build a new Church, a united Church, a Christendom at peace with itself. After centuries of grievous divisions the churches of the world are being brought together in the spirit and fellowship of unity. The emphasis on denominationalism is passing. The number of those who are willing to defend the present day divisions within the Church is constantly diminishing. Wide differences of opinion prevail as to the most effective means of healing these divisions, but that they should be healed there does not seem to be the slightest doubt.

This ideal of a united Church has challenged the imagination of youth. The younger churchmen of to-day have set their faces toward the dawn of a new era in the history of organized Christianity. Division is slowly but inevitably yielding to unity. The prayer of the first and foremost Christian will yet be answered. When the question is raised as to why youth should be particularly interested in this problem of Christian unity the answer is immediately forthcoming that the man who on the way to the Garden of Gethsemane first prayed for the unity of the Church was a young man. That must never be forgotten. Jesus was not old enough to be practical. He was quite too young to be familiar with the things that couldn't be done. It was in the audacious faith of his early thirties that Jesus prayed for the religious unity of his followers. Other

* This is the opening chapter in Mr. Van Kirk's new book, entitled *Youth and Christian Unity*, published by the George H. Doran Company, New York. Both the author and publisher granted us the courtesy for the publication of this chapter in *The Christian Union Quarterly*. It is a remarkably fine survey of the whole field of Christian unity.

young men are now following in the footsteps of their youthful Master. They too are praying for the Oneness of the Church of God. And they are determined not only to pray for Christian unity but to labour for its achievement.

This widespread interest in Christian unity is part and parcel of a new philosophy of life that has lately gripped the soul of the world. Disillusioned by the war men are now seeking reality. We are witnessing at the present time the most significant intellectual awakening of the past five hundred years. Youth is sharing and in many places leading in this quest for truth. Politics has already begun to yield to this influence. Intelligent young men are not as orthodox, politically, as their fathers were. They are not branded with the party labels of yesterday. They are independent in their political thinking. They refuse to be herded into servility by "ward bosses." Their look into the future is not gauged by their perspective of the past. This larger view of things has been carried over into the general field of race relations. Youth doesn't regard the riddle of race as insoluble. There never was a time when racial bigotry was so manifestly out of date. This is said despite the periodic revival of such organizations as the Ku Klux Klan. It may be said here that there are very few Klan organizers on our college campuses. Youth is gloriously unafraid of the widely advertised "rising tide of colour." Youth is primarily concerned with the rising tide of human brotherhood. Youth is committed to the essential oneness of humanity and the fundamental social and spiritual equality of the races.

The more thoughtful among our youth have, moreover, responded to the ideal of an international fellowship. Youth refuses to burn incense before the gods of national selfishness. Without sacrificing for a moment his devotion to his native land youth looks afar and sees in the need of other people an opportunity for the functioning of a Christian patriotism. Increasingly it is becoming true that the young men and women of to-day are citizens of the world.

Having once disassociated themselves from these political, racial, and national prejudices it is only natural, indeed

inevitable, that these same young people should look with a certain measure of divine impatience upon those theological and religious prejudices that are responsible for the continued divisions within the Church of Christ. Their interest in church union is a logical by-product of a mental process that is gravitating away from division and in the direction of unity. This passion for racial, political, and religious unity represents youth's objective in the modern crusade for a better world order. Their concern in and for a united Christendom is woven into the fabric of their whole philosophy of life. To them church union is something more than a mere item of passing interest. To many thousands of the present generation of young people the unification of Christendom has become nothing less than a life purpose, a summons that must and shall be obeyed.

It might be well to clarify at this point just what we mean by the term "Christian unity." The followers of Jesus Christ have yet to come to a mutual understanding of the meaning of unity. To some it means a federating of Christian forces for the carrying on of a common programme of religious activity. Unity from this viewpoint is a spiritual something, the benefits of which can be made available to the Church at large without the surrendering of denominational titles. To others Christian unity means the organic union of two or more communions with the absolute and final obliteration of denominational distinctions. Both the co-operative and the organic phases of Christian unity will be referred to in these pages. The federation phase of Christian unity is very well illustrated in America through the functioning of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. The organic union phase of this movement has been dramatically brought to the attention of the world through the merging of the Congregational, Presbyterian, and Methodist bodies in Canada into a single, united church. We shall trace the progress of these two aspects of Christian unity in America and throughout the world, being careful to specify in each instance just what it is that we are discussing. The Christian youth of to-day are primarily interested in the church federation adventure. When they speak of

Christian unity it is generally the co-operative work of the churches to which reference is made. Not a few of our youth, however, view federation only as a step in that process through which the Holy Spirit will make of these mutually divergent communions one living organism.

We see here one of the most gratifying results of that inquiry process that insists upon examining the Church in the light of modern conditions. There is not the slightest disposition among the more far seeing of these young people to discount the past, nor to belittle the service rendered by those intrepid souls who in their devotion to the Church felt called upon to further divide its ranks. There may have been sufficient reason for the inception of every one of the scores of denominations that now lift their spires skyward. Martin Luther, John Calvin, John Knox, John Wesley, George Fox, and all the rest are respected for their opinions and admired for their efforts. Their places are secure. The contributions which they made to the building of the Church triumphant are gratefully recognized. But these men, prophetic though they were, did not live in our world. Their problems were not our problems. They spoke to their day and generation, but the ear of the present listens for a voice that speaks the language of to-day. We keep faith with the dead not by perpetuating what the dead have done but by courageously doing what the dead would do were they among the living. Motivated, therefore, by the same earnest desire to know the will of God for his Church that burned in the breast of the heroes of yesterday, the young people of to-day are determined to examine the Church afresh, and with the courage so abundantly exemplified by their fathers, make whatever changes or adjustments within the Church that appear to be necessary to meet the needs of the present hour. Youth cannot but recognize that most of the conditions that originally made necessary these divisions within the Church have ceased to exist. There is, therefore, no justification for their continuance. Youth's interest in Christian unity does not inhere in their failure to appreciate the past. Our young people aspire to Christian unity not because they

love the denominations less but because they love their common Christ more.

In building this Church of to-morrow these young people take a long look into the past. They do not stop with Luther, nor with Huss, nor with Arnold of Brescia, nor with Saint Francis, nor with Augustine, nor with Athanasius. They are not satisfied to linger within the shadow of the brilliant age that produced such men as Cyprian, Tertullian, Origen, and Polycarp. Our young people in their devotion to the Church insist upon going back to Jesus Himself. Their theology, their attitude toward life, their impatience with the *"status quo,"* are rooted to what they believe to be the fundamental purpose of Jesus for his Church. He is their divine pattern. They appeal from the decisions made by the church fathers and the theologians to the authority of Jesus. Always the questions are, "What would Jesus say?" "What would He do?"

Looking about them these young people see on every hand the evidences of man-made divisions within the Church, the body of Christ. On this corner may be found the church of a certain denomination. Across the street there is a church of another faith. Down the avenue there is yet another gospel preached from the pulpit of another sect. In the last analysis it is the same gospel that is being preached from these various pulpits but the strength of the message is vitiated because of these seeming divisions. In other words we are maintaining outward forms of a division which in fact do not exist. Out of the chaos of this unhappy situation there emerges the solemn inquiry, "Are these divisions included within Christ's purpose for his Church?" "Is it his will that all these various sects shall compete for the homage of the faithful?" "Is the Christ who prayed for the unity of the Church satisfied with the present situation?" Youth cannot believe that He is.

It will serve our present purpose briefly to refer to the Inquiry on "Youth and the Christian Way of Life in a Changing World," that was initiated by the World's Committee of the Young Men's Christian Association, in preparation for the 1926 Helsingfors Conference. A carefully prepared question-

naire was sent out to youth groups all over the world. These inquiries covered a wide range of subjects — home, school, church, relation of the sexes, patriotism, race, and world brotherhood. We are interested particularly in knowing what these young people had to say about the Church. It is to be remembered that these opinions are those of Christian youth, not those hostile toward religion, nor unfriendly toward the Church. Their estimate of organized religion must, for that reason, be thought of as at least honest, if not wholly adequate.

The following is from the Scottish report: "Our Lord lived and died a young man in the days of his flesh, and one pictures most, if not all, of his disciples as also possessing the physical strength and spiritual ardour, the enthusiasm and loyalty of youth. Religion had grown frigid and rigid, cautious and conventional, before Jesus made it young again. It might, therefore, be imagined that the Church He founded would make an instant and generous appeal to the young men. If it no longer does, it is at least legitimate to infer that it has grown old, or, if not old, at least middle aged, unimaginative and cautious, an ambulance and a baggage train, rather than a fighting army of God. Some such feeling undoubtedly underlies the attitude of many young people to-day." And again from this same youth group: "No doubt our denominational differences have done much to produce this weakening of the Church's power, and united testimony of her Master."

We no sooner recover from this rather frank criticism of religion and the Church, than we are brought face to face with what many of the young people of England, Ireland, and Wales are saying. Here are some of the indictments made against organized religion by these youthful followers of Jesus: "There are too many denominations and too much antagonism. A united Church is needed." "Churches are suffering from centuries of accumulated tradition—they must get back to the real Jesus." "The churches fail to attract men outside their ranks—men will not come in on the terms laid down by the churches, which are not open to opinion outside their creeds. The beauty of faith has degenerated into a tiresome and stale

formula. They do not grasp the truth that 'where the Spirit of God is, there is liberty.'" "Organized religion needs to be thoroughly overhauled. It does not appeal to the younger generation—services are too dull, prayers too stereotyped and monotonously spoken, hymns are not suitable, and sermons are below the intellectual standard needed to-day." "Organized religion is a force of great potentiality handicapped by lack of adventurous leadership, and hindered by a heritage of dogmatic traditionalism which hesitates to express itself in terms of modern life." "Its complacency, bigotry, and wranglings fill us with disgust; it contributes nothing toward the world's welfare."

From Uruguay comes this criticism: "The young people are dissatisfied with certain exaggerations and with a too conservative or dogmatic attitude which does not consider the spiritual tendencies of the rising generation." Similar testimonials have fallen from the lips of youth groups in many other countries. It will be seen that the young people whose voice has been made articulate in the Helsingfors Conference are quite outspoken in their condemnation of sectarian divisions. We are quite ready to charge at least a fraction of this criticism to the untutored exuberance of youth. But there yet remains a sufficient body of intelligently informed opinion so adverse to denominationalism as to make necessary some pretty clear thinking on the part of the adult leadership of the Church of the present day.

Convinced that this sectarianism does not represent the mind of Christ, it follows, as far as these young people are concerned, that these divisions must inevitably yield to the purpose of Him who bequeathed to us our common faith.

That is the programme of youth for the Church of the future. Surely there can be no objection if the loyalty of youth to Christ supersedes their loyalty to the particular denomination with which they have been associated by the accident of birth! Rather, there is every reason why age should ally itself with youth in the consummation of that purpose for which Christ both lived and died. It is this matchless devotion to

Christ that makes youth impatient with creedal disputes and intolerant of denominational divisions. As against the theological metaphysics of the fourth century the youth of to-day prefer the simple gospel story of the first century Christians. These young people are frankly sceptical of any theology or any metaphysics that makes for disunion. To their thinking the continued preservation of our denominational distinctions rests upon the fundamental premise that the theologians and the metaphysicians have discovered formulas of belief and conduct that were not implicit within the teachings of Jesus. Youth rejects that premise and, having rejected the premise, they see the whole denominational superstructure falling to the ground. Youth's interest in a united Christendom springs out of the inescapable logic of first century Christianity that loyalty to Jesus may be accomplished without dividing the ranks of the loyal. Youth believes that as we draw nearer to Christ we draw nearer to one another, individually, collectively, and institutionally, and that, when our purpose is one with Him, we shall have achieved peace within the Church, divisions will have disappeared, and unity will have been accomplished.

But let us not assume that this impatience with dogmatism and sectarianism is to be construed as hostility toward the Church as such. We will refer again to the report of the Helsingfors Inquiry Commission for a vindication of this statement, if it is felt that confirmatory evidence is necessary. The same young people who criticized the Church for its denominational rivalries, also had this to say: "The churches are doing good and useful work." "The churches are making a definite attempt to meet changed conditions, and are helpful in the lives of men." "Churches are a necessity, vital to the life of normal Christians. Churches, however, often get into ruts and need vitalizing; but to say there are faults is only to say that men are human." "Organized religion has a place to fill in this age, functions to perform. Although the churches may be imperfect, the Christian religion could not be a live thing without them. Nothing better has yet been found to replace them." "There is little real difference between any of

the churches. Why not have all the young men of the same age come together and be taught by a person whose specialty would be to reach young people?"

No, the more constructively minded of these young people are loyal to the Church, notwithstanding numerous statements to the contrary. They are critical to be sure. For that we should be profoundly grateful. The Church would very soon pass out of the life of the world were it not for the helpful criticism of each successive generation. The Church is a living organism. It is not static. Endowed with this capacity for growth and development it should ever welcome the eagerness of youth to change and amend. Therein lies the guarantee of progress. The Church will forfeit its right to continue if it ever assumes that as an organization it has evolved into a state of chronic perfection. Persuaded by the logic of this conviction, youth ventures to believe that the Church of to-morrow will more nearly represent the mind of Christ than the Church of to-day. Being still further convinced that the present day divisions within the Church do not represent the mind of Christ, youth has dedicated itself to the task of building a Church that will keep faith with Christ by living at peace with itself.

Interpreted upon the background of this noble purpose it will be seen that this criticism of the Church on the part of these young people is of the highest order. It is not Pharisaic. Neither is it born of bigotry. Nor is it small minded nor meticulous. Youth recognizes that no other institution can take the place of the Church. It is just because they see in the Church the spiritual leaven of human society that they want to release its influence from all that divides and dissipates. Such a purpose is wholly constructive. It tears down in order that it may build up. We are convinced that this so-called hostility of youth to the Church is pure fabrication.

At the peril of being charged with inconsistency, we will admit that many thousands of our young people never give the Church a serious thought. In that respect they are not unlike their fathers. At no time has it ever been true that youth, as a whole, has been for or against any given cause. There are

to-day many irreligious youth who seem incapable of lifting themselves above the level of jazz conduct or of jungle ethics. That is to be deplored, but it is true. It is also true that hosts of young people are determined, as never before, that Jesus' way of life shall be incorporated into the life of men and of nations. The Church is the direct beneficiary of that noble purpose. There is to-day more genuine interest in conferences of religion, in institutes of religious fellowship, and in courses of study touching upon religious themes than ever before in the history of the Church. Never before have students been so insistent upon the complete Christianization of our industrial, racial, and international life. Seldom, if ever, has youth shown such an earnest desire to share in the programme of the Church. It simply is not true that youth has thrown the Church overboard. On the contrary, the Church is looked upon as the one remaining hope for the salvaging of civilization.

When, therefore, we speak of youth and their interest in Christian unity, we do not mean to infer that young people everywhere are concerning themselves seriously with this issue. Nor do we mean that the present generation of youth is rallying in mass formation to the defense of the Church and for the espousal of Christian principles. What we do mean is that, when young people think about the Church in its organized relationships, it is generally with regard to some form of interdenominational activity. Indeed the youth of which we speak may be in the minority, but it is a very persistent, aggressive, and articulate minority. And what is more, it is a growing minority. Among these young people are to be found those who will inevitably emerge into places of leadership and responsibility in years to come. What these young people think is, for that reason, of great significance to the Church. The term "youth" as made use of in this volume has reference to those more prophetic groups of our young people who have purposed in their hearts to remain faithful to the Church and loyal to its mandates.

But it must be a united Church. Youth's loyalty to the Church is not measured by the yardstick of denominational

prestige but by the advances that have been and are being made to enthrone Christ in the life of the world. Youth believes that only a united Church will be sufficient for the task of bringing God's Kingdom down from the skies. Put to the pragmatic test they see denominationalism condemned. And youth is pragmatic. Youth wants a Church that will refuse to surrender when challenged by the forces of evil. These young people want a Church whose denominational constituents are Christian enough to decrease that Christ might increase. They see but little hope for the future of the human race unless organized Christianity is able to add to its strength through the consummation of religious unity.

What will be the answer of the Church's adult statesmen to youth's demand for the unification of Christendom? Not a few of these older folks have already climbed up into the seat of the scornful. They regard the aspirations of youth in this regard as utter nonsense, as impossible vagaries. Others who have grown old only to see their own youthful dreams unrealized have added cynicism to their scorn. Still others who are honestly opposed to the principle of Christian unity cannot but discourage those who would tear down our denominational line fences. Their opinion must be respected, and is. Among those who hold this view are many whose lives have been epics of sacrifice. They have served their denominations nobly and in thus serving they have come to love and revere the Church of their choice. It would be surprising if they were able to dissolve the denominational ties of a life-time without certain doubts and misgivings. Young people do not propose thoughtlessly to disregard this point of view. They are not without patience for a denominational consciousness that has been quickened by an unstinted devotion to the things of God. But they do lack patience for that peculiar type of denominational prejudice that is born of bigotry and that is nurtured by the scorn heaped upon the devotees of another faith.

It will become increasingly evident that a majority of the present day leaders of the Church will be found working in sympathetic co-operation with their younger comrades. Not a

few of these denominational spokesmen have been pioneering in the field of Christian unity for many years. They see in youth's clear call for a closer fellowship among the churches an indication that their labour has not been in vain. There will be, in many instances, a joining of hand and heart between youth and age upon this most important issue.

It has been said that youth is pragmatic. It is. But it is more than that. Like Galahad of old these young people of whom we speak have seen a vision, and they mean to pursue it. It is the vision of a united Church, a Church whose creed is the Cross and whose Saviour is Jesus Christ the Lord. Theirs is a Divine mandate and obey they must. They are resolved to put an end to the shame of a divided Church. They are determined that Christ's body shall no longer be rent asunder. Youth sees, on the one hand, a denominationalism whose glory is fading; a religion that is burdened with the excesses of bigotry and weighed down by the mill-stones of man-made encumbrances; a faith that is vitiated by hundreds of isms and invalidated by all sorts of claims to infallibility; a discipleship that competes against itself; a programme for world redemption that divides the human race into creedal segments; a Church so broken and so divided that the world mocks at its claim to be the voice of the living God. Youth sees, on the other hand, the ideal Church, the Church for which Christ prayed, the Church for which He lived and laboured, and which He loved; a Church that is truly catholic and whose doors are open to receive every seeker of the Divine; a Church whose gospel of reconciliation has brought peace within as well as without; a Church so devoted to the exhaltation of Christ that denominational differences are dwarfed into insignificance and age long barriers of religious prejudice are burned away; a Church that has achieved Christian unity and that, in so doing, has become the Church militant and the Church triumphant.

Such is the vision of youth for the Church of Christ. Having set their hands to the plow there will be no turning back. They will never yield to the tempter's voice that it is easier to submit than it is to conquer. Theirs is the mind and

the heart of the crusader. There can be and will be no surrender. How then can there be defeat? There will be disappointments, to be sure, and discouragements. It may be that these young people will go to their graves with the promised land of their labours yet in the distance. But they will die with faith enough to believe that their children and their children's children will worship God at the altars of a united Church. There is no power on earth, no matter how strong or how deeply entrenched, that is able to prevail against such a lofty purpose, against such an eternal hope. Youth has dreamed and the Church will never be the same. Youth has lighted the candles of God in the temples of the world. In this Divine glow men will be shown the way to Him who is the Church's one foundation.

WALTER W. VAN KIRK.

THE TESTING

When in the dim beginning of the years,
God mixed in man the raptures and the tears
And scattered through his brain the starry stuff
He said, "Behold! Yet this is not enough,
For I must test his spirit to make sure

That he can dare the vision and endure.
I will withdraw my face,
Veil me in shadow for a certain space,
And leave behind only a broken clue,
A crevice where the glory glimmers through,
Some whisper from the sky,
Some footprint in the road to track me by.

I will leave man to make the fateful guess,
Will leave him torn between the no and yes,
Leave him unresting till he rests in me,
Drawn upward by the choice that makes him free—
Leave him in tragic loneliness to choose,
With all in life to win or all to lose."

—Edwin Markham..

CAN THE BIBLE BE THE BASIS OF CHRISTIAN UNION?

BY DEAN W. J. LHAMON
Columbia, Missouri

We are four full centuries from the days of Luther. During these centuries, though the Protestant appeal has been to the Bible as the full and final rule of faith and practice, there have appeared more than two hundred Protestant sects—a new one, on the average, every two years! Chillingworth voiced the attitude of Protestants generally when he said: "The Bible and the Bible alone is the religion of Protestants." Luther, Calvin, Zwingli, John Wesley, John Knox, and Alexander Campbell each made his appeal to the Bible and based his teachings on it. Yet Luther refused his hand to Zwingli when they differed about the eucharist, and John Wesley and John Knox were at opposite theological extremes, and Alexander Campbell could not stay in either the Presbyterian or Baptist Church.

The Protestant appeal to the Bible was made in opposition to the Roman Catholic appeal to the church as the seat of authority. That church holds her children by her claim to apostolic succession and infallible truth. The great Protestant leaders were driven, or felt themselves driven, to an opposing standard of infallible authority, and this they found in the Bible. And not the great leaders only but minor ones have assumed the same standard. Theoretically, therefore, we should all be one. Actually we have hundreds of varieties of churchly belief ranging all the way from strict Calvinism to broad Arminianism; from orthodox High-churchism to Christian Scienceism, from fourth century trinitarianism to twentieth century Unitarianism; and from strict sacramentalism to mystical quietism and Quakerism. Yet, all the while and everywhere, the appeal is to the Bible.

Still more challenging, if possible, is the fact that every now and again serious cleavages occur within denominations that make the loudest boast of their loyalty to the Bible. The Baptists have their Free-will and their Hardshell groups, their open and close communionists, and their Modernists and Fundamentalists. There are a dozen or more kinds of Presbyterians. There are several kinds of Methodists, though John Wesley adopted from the Thirty Nine Articles that clause which affirms of the Holy Scriptures that "they contain all things necessary to salvation, so that whatsoever is not read therein nor may be proved thereby is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation." The youngest of the greater bodies of believers in America, the Disciples of Christ, have a kind of secondary creed in the saying, "Where the Bible speaks we speak and where the Bible is silent we are silent." But they too are divided on the trivial question of instrumental music in church worship and the further question of the organization and support of missionary societies. Those calling themselves "The Churches of Christ," though relatively few and weak, refuse to have fellowship with the much greater and more progressive wing of the denomination. And further, that greater and more progressive portion of the denomination is now threatened with another cleavage by a revival of what is virtually the old Anabaptist controversy of the sixteenth century, the question of rebaptism of unimmersed Christians, or, as they term it, the question of "open membership."

The logic of consequences is squarely before us. Protestants may still affirm and broadcast it to the world that the Bible and the Bible alone is their religion. But why has it not united them? The condition of disunion is an open fact and in many cases it runs into a frightful spirit of sectarianism.

Something is wrong. The fault is not in the Bible. It must be in our misconception of it, our misinterpretation of it, and our consequent misuse of it. One hears here and there a cry almost of agony for release from the Bible. There are people whose minds are closed to science, to history, and to the moral

issues involved in sociology and politics, and the feeling is that the Bible has done it. "If Christians could only forget their Bibles for ten years it would be a great advantage to the cause of Christianity and social progress," was the recent cry of an ardent social worker. As a passion the cry is justifiable, but not as a reasoned conclusion.

Protestantism has attempted to build on two assumptions, both of which are false, and one of which, at least, the reformers of the sixteenth century inherited from the Roman Church. This inherited assumption is that we need and can have an infallible authority in religion. On the contrary, there is no such thing as infallibility in religion; we do not need it, and, if we had it, we could not use it, since we ourselves are so fallible. There is in reality no infallibility anywhere for anybody. It is not in astronomy or chemistry or biology or geology. The business man does not have it, nor the artist nor the musician nor the orator. And the claim of it is one of the heaviest burdens Christianity has had to bear. What we need is not infallibility but inspiration and guidance and growth. Something very like this must have been in the mind of Jesus when he took a little child and set him in the midst of his disciples, and warned them that unless they became as children they could not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.

Holding to the assumption of infallibility, the next step was to make the Bible the infallible and consequently inerrant standard. Consequent to this the popular conception of the Bible on the part of Protestants is that it is the word, and the only word, of God; that it is Divinely, verbally inspired and that there is no human element in its inspiration; that it is a level book, one part just as Divine and binding as another; that it is a revelation in full of all that God has said to us and done for us; that it is final and static, a Divine law to a chosen people; and that no man can add to or take from it except at his everlasting peril. It must contain rules for everything that is right and prohibitions of everything that is wrong. It is the sum total of wisdom, of history, of science, and whatever goes against it is heretical and dangerous. There must be in it a

"chapter and verse" for every feature of religious conduct, sacraments, order of worship, polity, creed, and life. Incidentally it may guide and inspire, but it is first of all a body of hard laws, a set of rigid commandments, a jail to the souls of men, and life must be seen through its barred windows.

With such a conception there must follow misinterpretation and misuse. By such misuse texts are found to prove every form of doctrine or whim of conduct. Shakespeare observed, "There is no error so damned but some sober brow will quote it and approve it with a text." Given, an infallible Bible, full and final and static, all parts equally expressive of God's will, and equally and permanently authoritative—then slavery is justifiable, and polygamy, and witch burning, and capital punishment for twenty crimes or more, and the extermination of enemies, and confiscation of lands by God's order, for all these appear in the Old Testament, and they have, according to the writers, the sanction of God.

Allegorical interpretation comes in for its share in the havoc of bibliolatry. The end of the world has been discovered as falling due on each of fifty or more different dates. The birth of Shakespeare, and of the Kaiser, of Napoleon and of Mohammed, have all been discovered as foretold in prophecy. Also the invention of the locomotive and the automobile. It must have called out real genius, however, to discover that Adam and Eve entered the Garden of Eden at noon and fell by two o'clock, and that polygamy is wrong because God took only one rib from Adam and made of it only one woman. One interpreter finds a prohibition of buttons and button holes; another, of instrumental music in church services; another of high schools because the Apostle Paul says, "Mind not high things"; and to cap the climax a certain barber has found a text that forbids him to bob women's hair! The list is endless.

Then there is the fallacy of the fragment. By a skillful rejection and selection of texts, and by a like skillful lifting and replacement of them, any doctrine, or polity, or sectarian peculiarity is quickly justified. Denominations easily fall into this fallacy, and most of them are guilty of it. The credentials

are at hand—a line of texts like a string of beads. On the supposition that the whole Bible is inerrant and authoritative, any part of it which slants in the right denominational direction should be a good denominational prop. Fifty other texts may be against it but with the sectarian zealot that does not signify, for he never sees them. On such conceptions and such misuse of the Bible Christian union can never be built. Before union can come bibliolatry must cease. To conceive the Bible as infallible is to make of it a kind of god, and, in a measure, to worship it, and some kind of spiritual or organizational folly is sure to follow. Before Christians can unite they must know the Bible rather than worship it. They must discover what it really is and what its functions are. Such discovery is hard since we have stood so long in a false attitude toward it.

There must come a new conception of the Bible or we must go crippling on in our traditional, denominational ways, with, maybe, our confusion worse confounded. Biblical scholarship must save us or there is no salvation for us. We must turn to the critics (as unfortunately they are called); the textual critics; the historical and literary students; in a word, the higher critics. It is they who seek to know exactly what the Bible is, and what its values and functions are. Real scholars are without denominational predilections. They are free from sectarian slants. They are dominated by the academic spirit and the scientific motive. In their single-eye search for truth biblical scholars belong in the class with astronomers, geologists, chemists, linguists and historians. Facts are a legal tender in the world of science and they should be so in the world of religion. The scholar's reverence is for facts rather than speculations or dogmas or party props.

Four things are demanded of the scholar; he must be painstaking, discriminating, honest, and brave. In settling one thing he may unsettle a score of other things, but what he unsettles is exactly what should be unsettled if truth is to triumph. To-day the biblical scholar is a specialist. He is a man of research. He follows the inductive method just as his brother scientists do in other departments of learning. He

spends his life among his languages and histories and in his laboratories and libraries. Other sciences come to his help—ethnology, chronology, philology, and archeology. As we trust our specialists in medicine and surgery, in law and engineering, so will we trust our biblical specialists, if we are dominated by wisdom and candour and not by any dogmatic or denominational complex.

Bible scholars are doing things for us that are invaluable as related to Christian union. They are setting us an example of the academic spirit in relation to one another. That is, they treat each other's results with candour, and when they differ, as all students must, they take their differences in friendly ways, or even as a spur to co-operation in further research. Scholarship has repudiated the rack, the thumb-screw, the *auto da fé,* and newspaper vituperation. Scholars know that truth is not a pearl to be found in the field of prejudice, and that the whip-hand of persecution satisfies nothing but the perfervid zeal of the sectarian and the bigot. Scholars work in unison, if not in unity, and, in their search for truth, they are more than tolerant; they are friendly. Tempered by the habit of patient research, and knowing the dangers of dogmatism, the scholar pursues the even tenor of his way, gladly granting the same privilege to other scholars. Fundamentally the scholars of our day are a fraternity of truth seekers and truth finders, a fraternity unorganized, but none the less co-operative for that. They constitute the church within the church and their voice holds the hope of the future.

Just as scholarship has turned astrology into astronomy and magic into medicine, so it is turning an untaught hyper-reverence for the Bible into a reasoned study of it. Superstition can no longer have a monopoly of the sacred word; reason and research are bound to have their innings. To-day everything must go into the crucible of criticism, and the best friends of the Bible should be the first to invite the test. The gold will keep. If there is dross we should know it.

Scholarship has disclosed to us the fact that the Bible is a distinctly human collection of writings as well as a distinctly

Divine one. Its writers were inspired as men can be inspired, that is, each according to his own measure. Amos, for instance, had his degree of inspiration; Isaiah his; Moses his; and so of all, including the unknown writers of the Pentateuch, of Proverbs, of Job, and of other parts of the Old Testament. These men wrote each as he could, out of his own environment, predilections, and passions. The stream of inspiration comes to us through "earthen vessels," as St. Paul would say. In view of this we should expect to find in the Old Testament distinct traces of this human element, such as folk-lore, mythology, poetry, fiction, and the heightening of historic incidents. And that is exactly what we do find.

It is to scholarship that we owe the discovery of a progressive disclosure of God in the Bible. The God of Genesis is, in reality, an anthropomorphic super-man, who, according to very ancient tribal notions, created the world—our little world—in six days, but was exhausted and had to rest the seventh day. Developing through centuries, there came the prophetic thought about God, the sublime conception, for instance, of Isaiah in his trishagion, the "Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God Almighty." The term ethical monotheism best expresses the theology of the later prophets, and there is nothing better coming to us out of the pre-Christian centuries. Jesus seizes on that as the best that his people had to give and transmutes it into paternal monotheism. To Jesus God is Father, and the term is more than a metaphor with Him. The immanent spirit God of Jesus, in his Fatherliness is

> Nearer to us than breathing,
> And closer than hands and than feet.

He works without regard to days. He clothes the lilies and feeds the sparrows and cares as a husbandman for the vineyards on a thousand hillsides, and runs to meet returning prodigals. The later prophets, with their deeper experience and broader civilized life, could not think of God as their tribesmen ancestors did two thousand years before.

The relation of the Old Testament to the question of Christian union can scarcely be held as a vital one. Scholarship has shown us that the Old Testament consists of the history of the Hebrew people as written by themselves; and of their poetry, their prophecy, portions of their apocalyptic writing, and their pragmatic philosophy, popularly known as their proverbs. All in all, it is the literature of a great ancient super-race of super-tribesmen fighting their zigzag way through bad to better and through better to best. It is the Bible of an ethnic religion, the religion of the Jews distinctively. Because of its Jewish limitations it never could be a catholic or world religion. One feature alone would forbid that, namely, its centralized sacrificial worship in Jerusalem. But there are also other limiting features; there are its rigid Sabbath laws, its circumcision, its complex system of taboos, and its heavy insistence on the par-excellence of the Jews as the chosen people of God. It is significant that Jesus, in planning a world religion, left all these limiting features behind. The sermon on the mount is less a sermon than a state paper; it is the platform of the Saviour's new Kingdom. As such it is almost as remarkable for what is not in it as for its actual contents. A critical study of it, and also of the whole body of the teachings of Jesus, shows that his attitude toward the Old Testament was a selective one. He used what he needed of it, what appealed to Him, and let the rest go by. He did more; he repealed some of the lingering laws of its ancient tribalism.

Another limiting feature of the Old Testament as regards Christian union is its underlying governmental concept. It is theocratic. And fundamentally there is no distinction between the church and the state. Virtually there is no church, it is all state. The word church does not occur in the Old Testament. God is the rightful ruler of the state with whatever religious establishment it might have, and the priest-king was his vicegerent. The king reigned, therefore, by Divine right, and he was a religious functionary as well as a political one. The priest, likewise, held his office by Divine right, and he too was a state-church functionary.

Surely the Christianity of Christ, as presented in the New Testament, is far removed from all that. The distance is so great and the difference is so sharp, as shown by critical study, that the man who follows Jesus simply and intelligently, feels himself absolved from the state-church legislation, the altar forms of worship, and the above stated governmental concept of the Old Testament.

Being so absolved he does not go to the Old Testament to find inerrancy, or authority, or types of worship, or legislation, or finality in science and history. Such matters may concern him in an academic way, but they do not concern him in any vitally Christian way. Such absolution is a great gain in the struggle toward Christian union. It eliminates many a disturbing question. Suppose that Genesis and geology cannot be made to harmonize; that should not disturb the well informed Christian for a moment. On the contrary, divergence between Genesis and modern science is just what one should expect, in view of all the conditions. Genesis and geology are not comparable; they move in different planes. The former belongs in the plane of religion, and tribal religion at that. The latter moves in the plane of science, and any thing like science was unknown when Genesis was written. So with other questions. How many Isaiahs were there? Was there ever a fish big enough to swallow Jonah? Could Noah, by any possibility, have built an ark big enough to house all the beasts? Where did Cain get his wife? These and hundreds like them are to the Christian of no significance whatever. The book of Jonah, for instance, has no more relation to the problems of Christianity and of Christian union than the poetry of Shakespeare or the dialogues of Plato.

If, then, Christians are to unite, they must come to the intelligent conviction that they are twentieth century followers of Jesus and not Mosaists of the B. C. centuries. The one dynamic doctrine to be carried over from the Old Testament is the ethical monotheism of the later prophets. But even that is transmuted by Jesus from a monarchical monotheism into a paternal monotheism, for nothing in the teaching of Jesus is

more patent than his insistence on the Fatherliness of God. The New Testament does not use the Jewish term Jehovah for God. Jesus and his disciples seem to have avoided it. Most frequently they use the term "Father" instead, and this term occurs three hundred times. In his first recorded sentence the word Father finds its consecration on the lips of the young student in the temple. And in his last sentences on the cross Jesus lifts his soul to God as "Father." Between the monarchical monotheism of the Old Testament and the paternal monotheism of the New there is a difference as wide as that between autocracy and democracy.

As compared with the Old Testament the New Testament stands in a quite different relation to the problem of union. But even here there must be emancipation from popular conceptions of a full and final and static book, with doctrines and laws and precedents Divinely decreed and unchangeable. Scholarship shows that such finality is not there. New Testament history and introduction have revealed to us a growing and changing literature answering to a growing and changing church. This fact points to the conclusion that the New Testament is not the final literature of a final church, but the incipient production of an incipient church. The church was first and the New Testament came from her bosom. The church was the mother of the book, and of many other books which were lost or rejected. Our New Testament was winnowed by a severe historical process from a much larger body of writings. This winnowing process ran through a period of more than two hundred years, during which the New Testament church was without the authorized New Testament canon.

To us, with our cart-before-the-horse ways of thinking, it seems a marvel that the church could live and grow without the book, and even create the book meanwhile. But the fact is that the church of the first and second centuries did live and grow and was united before the book was canonized. And a further fact is that the ancient church was not divided till her sons began to use the book as an authority in the construction of dogmas. Then the trouble began. It is a long-lived calamity

that the sweetest, most entrancing, most dynamic body of literature ever produced by the inspired souls of men should have been degraded into an arsenal of authoritative texts to be used like so many shields or swords in wordy battles over sectarian whims. A vast deal of our sectarianism to-day can be traced to no other source than the untaught misuse of the New Testament.

Before Christians can unite the New Testament must be restored to its original functions of witnessing, of guidance, and of inspiration. It must be taken way from the dogmatists and it must be given back to the Marys and Marthas, the Johns and Thomases, and all the other lovers of Jesus and beloved disciples of his, and they must be taught to see it not as a fort or an arsenal, but as the fountain of the "more abundant life."

In the Old Testament there is a body of theocratic legislation that grew and changed through a thousand years. In the New Testament there is no legislation. There is exhortation and inspiration and precept and precedent; and there is a constant Divine appeal to earth's profoundest motive—love; but there is no legislation. Peter and Paul and James and John were not law makers; they were apostles, missionaries, heralds of good news, gardeners in a new spiritual Eden, seed sowers in the world field of Christ's new Kingdom. Their commission from the Master Himself was to teach all nations; to "make disciples" everywhere; but they had no authority to make laws, either political or ecclesiastical, for all nations or any nations.

The church of the first two centuries, being without a Bible of its own, and in process of making one of its own, reverted to the Old Testament for such help as it could get there in devotional and prophetic ways. But it had a hard time pulling away from certain features of the Old Testament, such as its rigid Seventh Day Sabbath laws, and circumcision, and the various taboos, especially those relating to unclean birds and beasts. One of the hardest fought battles of the Apostle Paul was against his Judaizing brethren who wanted to fasten all the Old Testament on the young church—who were bent on keeping the new wine in the old skins. The book of Galatians

is an emancipation proclamation from such cramping features of Judaism as its outgrown ethnic forms, its unyielding externalism, and its failure to distinguish between social and ceremonial sins. That book is a polemic of tremendous power, and its first value is in its demand for spiritual freedom. And that also is the chief value of the book of Romans. And the writer of the book of Hebrews joins St. Paul in his great anti-legal, spiritual adventure, so that it too is a cry for freedom.

In the matter of organization the church of the first and second centuries was guided by expediency, by the spirit of fraternity, and by a measurable imitation of the Jewish synagogue. Little bands of believers, meeting now in one home and then in another, selected elders and deacons (or helpers) as they needed them, and some of St. Paul's Gentile churches seem not to have gone that far. The call was for brotherly, spiritual leadership, and the motive was not a chapter-and-verse one but a pragmatic one. In short, the church, as it appears in the pages of the New Testament, is not the church of the New Testament, but the church creating both itself and the New Testament. Original Christianity was not a book religion. It was at the hands of mistaken friends that it became in any sense the religion of a book the contents and functions of which are misconceived, misunderstood, and misapplied. Original Christianity was a religion of freedom and spiritual power. It was the religion of the Master Himself while He was with his disciples "in the days of his flesh." And immediately thereafter it was the religion of the one whom He announced as his vicegerent, namely, the Holy Spirit. We have ignored the fourteenth and fifteenth chapters of the Fourth Gospel. We have taken no account of the Master's promise that upon his going away the Father would send the Holy Spirit in his "place," and that this Spirit would "teach" his disciples "everything," and "remind" them of "everything" that He had told them. Thus He made the Holy Spirit his vicegerent (I insist on that word) to the exclusion of every priest and every book, and of whomever and whatever else. The confirmation of this appears on every page of our earliest history of the church, the book of

Acts. It was the Holy Spirit who dominated the day of Pentecost. It was the Holy Spirit who accompanied the Apostle Peter and his companions, and made them the tremendous and intrepid heralds that they were through all the months and years of the early church. It was the Holy Spirit who took the initiative in thrusting Barnabas and Paul out into the Gentile world. It was the Holy Spirit who fell on the "house" of Cornelius when he and his heard the preaching of the Apostle Peter, and brought them to conviction and conversion.

So early Christianity was the religion of Jesus personally, and of his own chosen vicegerent. It was a religion of love and not of law; of freedom and not of dogma; of growth and change and not of static formalism. It was a religion of "guidance" into growing, enlarging, adaptable truth. But when, in the third and fourth centuries, it became the religion of a book it began to harden, to dogmatize, and to breed orthodoxy on the one hand and heresies and heretics on the other. By the process an authoritative canon was interposed between the souls of men and their Saviour, and worship was, in part, transferred from the Man Jesus to the book about Him.

Other religions have shown the same tendency toward the apotheosis of their respective Bibles. Dr. Robert Ernest Hume in his book, *The World's Living Religions,* says: "For two among these sacred scriptures [he gives a list of eleven], the Rig Veda and the Koran, a theory of verbal inspiration and literal infallibility has been propounded as high as that set forth by some Christian theologians for the authority of the Bible. For all of them claims have been made as pre-eminent above the rest of literature. The followers of Zoroaster claim for the Avesta that 'It is the one marvel which, according to the best reports of the world, is a compendium of all the supremest statements of wisdom.'" Shinto worshipers say of their Bible, Nihon-gi: "There is none among all writings of the world so noble and important as this classic." The Granth, the Bible of the Sikhs, has become an object of actual worship, though not one in ten of its devotees knows the contents of it. This book is the exclusive divinity of the shrine at Amritsar.

"Every morning it is dressed out in costly brocade, and reverently placed on a low throne under a jeweled canopy. Every evening it is made to repose for the night in a golden bed in a consecrated chamber, railed off and protected from all profane intrusion by bolts and bars." Thus a god is made of the book, and instead of the study of it, there is the magical and superstitious worship of it as devout and as devoid of reason as the worship of a fetish or a totem pole.

Much of our sectarian devotion to the Bible is of the same kind, differing only in degree. It is too magical and irrational The vociferous affirmation by perfervid evangelists is not infrequent that they believe the Bible from cover to cover, though no pains have been taken in any rational way to know what is between those covers. There may be a jaunty air of devotion in the ejaculation "If the Bible should say that two and two are six I would believe it." But to those who are informed and who take a second thought that is not devotion; it is stultification.

From such an attitude scholarship must save us. Scholarship must give us an approach to the Bible not by way of tradition, or sectarian bias, or any kind of preconception, but by way of open-minded research, of protracted and painstaking study. Scholarship must help us to know, as nearly as possible, exactly what the Bible is, by whom its various parts were written, and to whom, and why; how they were coloured by local and historical conditions; to appraise the historical, literary, and religious values of its various sections; to estimate its varying laws and teachings from age to age; to discriminate between the transient and permanent in it; to sift and winnow and keep what is of abiding significance. It is only by such means that we can be delivered from biblical quacks with their multifarious sects and isms.

All praise be to the devout, Bible-loving and Christly-minded multitudes of the masses of men. Their influence for good is immeasurable. But it happens that the most devout and zealous among them are most dominated by wrong views of the Bible, and, therefore, the capacity for union is not in them. They lack the sense of values. They turn opinions into dogmas

and differences into heresies. They build sects on half truths fortified by scripture scraps. They are too liable to a hot and hasty zeal untempered by knowledge. For union we must look to the trained minds among us; the men whose zeal has the poise of knowledge; who have a keen sense of relativity; who have found the way into the catholic sanctuary of fact and truth; who know how to differ fraternally, and how to teach without tyranny. Union cannot come from below; it must come from above. The scholars must hand down to us the possibility of union by releasing us from a hypothetically inerrant and authoritative Bible, and by giving us, instead, the real Bible in the totality of its inspiration, its revelation, and its guidance. We must go to our biblical scholars to find deliverance from the proof-texts of our various sectarianisms and to receive back from them the same scriptures co-ordinated with the vast and catholic spirit of the living God and Father of Jesus, and the vast and catholic needs of the one human brotherhood.

W. J. LHAMON.

GOD IS!

God has no pleasure in those narrow souls
Who find Him only in an ancient creed;
His glory did not pass with one land's breed,
His aims are higher than one people's goals.
They worshiped well by smoking altar-mounds,
We worship too who hail far-flaming suns;
From age to age God's constant purpose runs—
Shall we presume to set his metes and bounds!

If God appeared to speak one mighty word
To one lone tribe, and thenceforth hid his face,
Where is He now? Whose voice is that now heard
Throughout the world in this good year of grace—
Another God's? Perhaps our hearts are stirred
By some strong baal of an alien race!

God is, not was: He builds the great To-day,
Nor looks He back on time's deep-shadowed way.

—Thomas Curtis Clark.

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY

The Monks of Unity

WITHIN the last few years there has been a great change of attitude in the Roman Church toward other Christian bodies. The former attitude of contempt and dislike is being displaced by more generous feelings. It is felt that bodies like the Orthodox Church and the Church of England, which believe in the fundamental Catholic doctrines, are on quite a different footing from those which reject the Catholic conception of the Church, grace, orders, and even the creeds. The former are Christians to be united; the latter, unbelievers to be converted.

Particularly in France and Belgium has it been felt that the old methods of controversy were neither Christian nor effective, and that nothing less than our Lord's own methods would avail to heal the wounds in his visible Body. But although this movement appears to find its expression chiefly in France and Belgium, it is no mere local enthusiasm. The pope himself is actively interested in it, and it is his ardent wish that "all should be one." He is indeed credited with the desire of being known as the pope of unity, and he has frequently called his subjects to prayer for this object.

Recently, he addressed a bull to the abbot primate of the Benedictines, desiring that certain of their abbeys should be definitely set aside for the work of union, in order that their monks might devote themselves to the study of their separated brethren—in particular of their languages, psychology, liturgies, and theology. Moreover, these monks were to seek to create in the West "a more intense current of zeal and study directed to the points which separate us from the orientals." He hoped that ultimately a monastic congregation of the Slav rite would be founded in Rome and spread to Russia.

In 1925 the nucleus of a new monastic institution, called "The Monks of the Union of the Churches," was constituted in Belgium, under the leadership of Dom Lambert Beauduin, O.S.B., with the object of devoting itself entirely to questions of reunion. It consists at present of about a dozen monks of different nationalities, one a Slav uniate, but others will shortly

be joining them. In 1926 appeared the first number of their monthly organ, *Irénikon,* which aims at giving information to Western Catholics about their separated brethren.

In the first number the editor outlines the policy and aims of the community. He wisely states that before there can be any question of formal and legal reunion, there must be "a spiritual reconciliation of minds and hearts. Every Christian must, therefore, begin by bringing about this *rapprochement* in his own soul: he must know, understand, respect, and love our separated brethren. Hierarchical and visible reunion can have no hope of success until union has been accomplished in people's minds through confidence and love. Each one of us . . . . must be a factor of unity." By prayer, thorough study, charity, and missionary activity, the monks aim at being "professionals" of unity, but they realize that their work cannot be properly done without the help of the faithful laity, whom they wish to associate with their work.

There must be no question of Latinizing the East. This has been done in the past and has merely embittered the Easterns. Latins are to remain faithful Latins, but they must respect the Easterns' love for their own rites and customs. "In short, let us be Catholics, i.e., universal and œcumenical."

Then, too, there must be no compromise of truth by either side. "Any *rapprochement* effected at the price of doctrinal concessions, skilful reticences, or ambiguous formulas, any action guided by any kind of political considerations, any movement for unity which is not solely inspired by love for Christ and his Church, would be worse than division." All their activities must be thoroughly straightforward and above-board. This is borne out by a very emphatic declaration. "The monks intend to abstain systematically from any action which would tend to alienate our separated brethren from their church in order to bring them back. There must be no proselytism, either individual or collective." Nor must benevolence be made a cloak for religious activity. They mention, for example, that no capital must be made out of the difficulties of the Russian *émigrés* in Paris in order to draw them away from their church.

All this has the Orthodox Church mainly in view, and the community was founded principally for work with the East. But quite a large part of the first three numbers of *Irénikon* has to do with the Church of England. The same spirit of fairness and charity marks all that they write about us. At the end of a really well-informed short survey of tendencies in the English Church, occur the following words: "We non-English

Catholics must abstain from appreciating religious events in England with our continental mentality. There is a great freedom of opinion and discussion in every department across the channel. Laws, rules, and official measures, before being imposed by authority, are slowly elaborated by public opinion and freely discussed in the press. Above all, let us not judge the different confessions by any private acts even of a priest or a bishop, but by official documents and the authentic decisions of qualified assemblies." Bishop Barnes's utterances must not be used for controversial propaganda against the Anglican Church. "At least one ought, at the same time, to make known the magnificent letter of protest addressed to the primate of Canterbury on July 25, 1925, by the E. C. U."

For many years Anglicans and Orthodox have been working together on these lines with the happiest results. A great many personal friendships have been made, much ignorance dispelled, many prayers said, with the result that affectionate relations exist between the two churches still formally out of communion. Reunion seems within almost measurable reach. The difficulties in the way of reunion with Rome are far greater, but it can surely be only to the good that both churches should really discover exactly what the other does believe, and should put away all prejudice and desire to score controversial points.

The Malines conversations are the outcome of the friendship of a Roman Catholic priest and an Anglican layman, both devoted and loyal sons of their respective churches. Cannot others follow their example by making friends with those separated from them, and by abstaining from all controversy until they can indulge in it with thorough sympathy and understanding? Let us make friends before we begin to discuss Anglican orders or papal infallibility. There must be no compromise of truth as anyone sees it. Individual conversions will only hinder reunion.

All who can read French would be well-advised to subscribe to *Irénikon.* It will keep them *au fait* with the reunion movement in the Roman Church.

It is frequently asserted that the English Church is in a particularly good position to play an important part in bringing about reunion. Perhaps she will emulate Rome in producing a religious order to work on the lines of the Monks of Unity. At least let her not be behind in charity, prayer, and sympathetic study of those who are separated from her by unhappy divisions.

[From L. Gage-Brown, in *The Church Times,* London.]

Motion of Protestant Groups Toward Unity Pleasing to Roman Catholics

THE attitude of the Catholic Church toward Protestant efforts in the direction of Christian unity is only too often misunderstood. The fact that the Catholic Church does not make herself one with those in *seeking* the very solution she offers them, does not mean that she is not interested in their efforts. On the contrary, two popes have encouraged and asked God's blessing on the endeavour that it may be guided according to his will. And now a semi-official comment by the vatican on the forthcoming Lausanne Conference, in which 87 denominations are to be represented, has reached us, and, whereas many Anglicans criticize the tentative programme of that conference, many Catholics high in authority see in it evidence that its promoters are actuated by that good-will which seeks peace on earth and that unity which is agreeable to God's will. The recent message from Rome given publicity through the N. C. W. C. News Service, reads in part as follows:

While Anglo-Catholic and certain Protestant denominations are voicing sharp criticisms of the World Conference on Faith and Order, which will convene in Lausanne August 3 to 21, 1927, at the call of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, and predicting that it will be "ephemeral, deceptive and even disastrous," Catholic ecclesiastical authorities here announce that they view with pleasure these Protestant meetings as a manifestation of the desire for unity, and that among the prayers offered for the success of this cause "those of Rome will be the sincerest, the warmest and the most confident."

This announcement is in striking contrast to the prediction made by one of the leading Anglican reviews that the conference "will be boycotted, and rightly so, by the Church of Rome." As a matter of fact, the conference has aroused great interest in Catholic circles and has been made the subject of extensive comment in the *Osservatore Romano.*

After outlining the programme of the conference, the *Osservatore* in its comment says, in part:

"If the impressions and comments which the mere announcement of the conference has aroused in the Protestant world are to be considered in forecasting its outcome, the result will not be particularly happy. The Anglo-Catholics, indeed, do not view it with a friendly eye. They criticize particularly the adhesion given by the Anglicans and Oriental schismatics to a meeting of Protestants. The latter deny the majority of the rites and dogmas held in honour by Anglicans and Orientals alike. 'How then,' asks an authoritative Anglo-Catholic review, 'can they agree on questions of faith and the sacraments?' 'The Stockholm Conference,' the review continues, 'was called ecumenical, but it was not ecumenical. The Lausanne Conference is called a world conference, but it will not be such. More than half of the Christians in the world will not be represented. Even the deplorable adhesion of a few Anglo-Catholics can not change illusion into reality and will not make the conference anything but an ephemeral, deceptive and, perhaps, disastrous attempt. The World Conference on Faith and Order, which, certainly, and with reason, will be boycotted by the Church of Rome, will afford a selected group of ecclesiastics from various nations an opportunity to pass a pleasant week in Switzerland, but it will have no

lasting value and can but augment confusion and emphasize more clearly than ever the abnormal position of the Anglican Church.'"

Declaring that "any comment on these words is superfluous," the *Osservatore* points out that "they show the incurable spirit of division which has afflicted those who have drifted away from Rome ever since the branches were broken off the age-old tree of the Catholic Church.

"For our part," says the *Osservatore Romano,* "as students and calm observers of religious phenomena, we are pleased to see in these meetings of the Protestant and schismatic world the need, the tortured desire, for unity. We are disposed to admit the good-will of those promoting it. But, at the same time, we are convinced that, if they are sincere in seeking unity, they will find it only where it is. Let them dig deep into the sub-soil of their traditions; at a certain point they will feel the tremor of an ancient current, vigorous and warm—the current of Rome. The great and ancient Mother, the Church of Peter and of Paul, stands in the land of the Romans, splendid in faith and the lawgiver of charity, just as it appeared in the supreme vision to the great Shepherd of the East who came to die on this soil to the end that his testimony to the one faith might be more clear and more precious. . . .

And it is particularly during the present days, when agitations and disillusionments cause the world to seek ever more anxiously for an *ubi consistam,* and when the ranks of the dissidents are moved by uncertain desires for union, that the generous Mother is moved by still greater thought and affection for them, etc."

[From *The Antidote,* Peekskill, N. Y.]

Should We be Afraid of Lausanne?

We find with regret the *Church Times,* London, expressing itself as hostile to the forthcoming Lausanne Conference on the Faith and Order of the Church. In two recent issues the matter has been discussed. Curiously enough, our contemporary persists in confusing this with the Stockholm Conference of last year, as though there were any sort of connection between the two—which there is not. Expressing the hope "that Anglo-Catholics would have nothing to do with this grandiloquently named meeting," the *Church Times* "very much regrets that wirepullers have secured the support of half a dozen names that Anglo-Catholics hold in honour." One wonders why Churchmen cannot express themselves courteously but must assume bad motives when good motives are so much more probable. We do not know who are the "wirepullers" referred to; but Anglo-Catholics in England thus insulted can scarcely continue to accord the *Church Times* that honour which once was gladly paid it as an Anglo-Catholic leader. Hatred of things American so warps the judgment of our able contemporary to-day that an Orangeman speaking of the pope is a model of sobriety in comparison. It is sad indeed that a new estrangement between English and American Churchmen and Anglo-

Catholics must probably be the ultimate result of this strange reversal by the *Church Times* of that statesmanlike policy so consistently pursued by its former editor, Dr. Hermitage Day. To the *Church Times* of to-day, America means puritanism, prohibition, and puerility—and nothing else.

The World Conference on Faith and Order was proposed and initiated entirely by the American church. Any idea of a connection between that and the movement that led to the different sort of conference held last year in Stockholm can only be the result of grotesque misinformation.

Bishop Brent first proposed it, if we remember rightly, in an address delivered at the time of the General Convention of 1910. He pointed out that the great missionary conference held in Edinburgh shortly before had been estopped from considering matters relating to the faith and order of the Church. Those questions, tabooed at Edinburgh, constituted, then, the issue which the Christian world must next consider.

To Dr. Manning, now Bishop of New York, belongs the honour of proposing legislation to meet that issue. It was on his motion that the subject was considered by a committee, which brought in a unanimous report which said, in part, as follows:

> Your committee is of one mind. We believe that the time has now arrived when representatives of the whole family of Christ, led by the Holy Spirit, may be willing to come together for the consideration of questions of Faith and Order. We believe, further, that all Christian communions are in accord with us in our desire to lay aside self-will, and to put on the mind which is in Christ Jesus our Lord. We would heed to this call of the Spirit of God in all lowliness, and with singleness of purpose. We would place ourselves by the side of our fellow Christians, looking not only on our own things, but also on the things of others, convinced that our one hope of mutual understanding is in taking personal counsel together in the spirit of love and forbearance. It is our conviction that such a conference for the purpose of study and discussion, without power to legislate or to adopt resolutions, is the next step toward unity. . . . .
>
> RESOLVED, the House of Bishops concurring, That a joint commission be appointed to bring about a conference for the consideration of questions touching Faith and Order, and that all Christian communions throughout the world which confess our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour be asked to unite with us in arranging for and conducting such a conference. The commission shall consist of seven bishops appointed by the chairman of the House of Bishops, and seven presbyters and seven laymen appointed by the president of the House of Deputies, and shall have power to add to its number and to fill any vacancies occurring before the next General Convention. —*Journal of the General Convention*, 1910, pp. 377, 378.

The appended resolution was adopted and a dignified commission of Churchmen was appointed under its terms. Breaking with the precedent set in connection with the Edinburgh Conference, to which only "Protestant" bodies were invited—

thereby losing the sympathy of the great bulk of Catholic Churchmen in England and America — this commission determined to make every effort to gather representatives of the entire Christian world into conference in such wise as to do justice to all while committing no body to any outcome of the deliberations. The conference was not to do more than "confer." Subsequently a sub-committee of bishops was designated to visit personally the heads of the great historic communions of East and West at their principal see cities in Europe and Asia. In the most formal manner the invitation to the Roman communion was presented by those bishops in person to the pope, and similar invitations to the chief bishops of the Eastern communions. The former declined; most of the latter accepted, as did the Church of England and each of its daughter churches. War was just breaking out and it was impossible, therefore, for the committee to complete its work. Little could be done during the dreary years of war except to enlist the interest of the larger Protestant communions of the United States—which, in many cases, was not easy. Not until the war was well past did it become possible really to resume negotiations on a world-wide scale.

That Rome refused to enter into conference with the rest of Christendom was, undoubtedly, a disappointment. But having been invited, with great cordiality and with an earnest desire for its acceptance, the proposed conference stands on a totally different basis from that at Edinburgh as well as from that afterward held at Stockholm, which latter, so far as we know, had not even been proposed at the time of the extension of invitations to the World Conference.

In one sense it is true, as the *Church Times* suggests, that, with Rome unrepresented, the Lausanne gathering will not be a *world* conference. But the title had already been given to it and represented the ideal that underlay it. The title is not erroneous in the sense that the Stockholm Conference was miscalled ecumenical. Indeed representatives of the Roman communion were also absent from actual councils universally reckoned as ecumenical. The distinction between the scope of the Lausanne Conference and those of Edinburgh and Stockholm is that the first is intended to embrace all communions in the world, and the others were not. It is a distinction of the most vital character.

Does the *Church Times* feel that after the historic churches of the East and those of the Anglican communion, as well as some of the Protestant bodies of America and England, had

accepted, the plans should have been given up because Rome declined to participate? We do not feel so. The very impression shows a total misconception of the scope of the conference.

For nothing is proposed that can possibly reflect upon the unrepresented communion. All that is proposed is to seek to discover the lines of concord and the lines of divergence between different bodies—not necessarily between all of them. For instance, how far together do Anglicans, Easterns, Presbyterians, Methodists—we will say—stand on the subjects of Baptism, of Holy Communion, of the nature of the Church? Up to a certain point they agree; beyond that they disagree. Very well; it is useful to ascertain how far they can agree. Let us assume these bodies all agree that Baptism was (a) ordained by Christ Himself; that (b) it is rightly termed a sacrament; that (c) it should be administered to all who desire to be incorporated into the Church, the body of Christ; that (d) Baptism is conferred by the application of water in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Perhaps beyond that they disagree. Then the representatives of the communions mentioned certify that they are agreed *that far*. It does not mean that Anglicans—or perhaps any of them—concede that that is a sufficient statement of their teaching as to Baptism. Much less does it mean that Anglicans—or any others—have receded from their further teaching on the subject. Moreover, this measure of agreement is not affected when it also appears that, perhaps, Baptists, Congregationalists, and, certainly, Quakers cannot accept the like measure of agreement. We conceive that there will come from Lausanne a large number of part-way agreements, none, or almost none of them, representing the entire body. In particular we can hope and pray that Anglicans, Eastern Orthodox, and Old Catholics will find themselves so largely in agreement everywhere that formal articles of intercommunion will be the inevitable next step; while also the breach between Orthodox and Armenians, and perhaps between the former and certain other Eastern bodies, may be healed then and there. Is none of this worth while?

Nor is that all. We believe that Anglicans, Presbyterians, and Lutherans will be amazed at the extent to which they will find themselves in agreement. No one will dream that that agreement will be so complete that no matters of divergence will remain. Even if their representatives actually succeeded in securing common ground on all questions at issue, it would not follow that they would or could proceed to commit their respective principals to any plan for unity between them. The

Church Times holds rightly that "there can be no unity between men who hold the Catholic Faith and societies that exist to subvert Catholic teaching," but it errs sadly when it supposes that the utterance of this truism, or any other of like import, has anything to do with the case. And even if the *Church Times* was right in its gloomy forebodings as to the futility of all this —which may conceivably prove to be true, in spite of the earnest and honest attempts that are being made—the fact that the Church of England was definitely and officially committed to the project years ago, and is not likely to withdraw from it now, would seem to make it exceedingly serious if English Catholic Churchmen, waiting until a few months before the conference is ready to convene, should proceed now—ten years too late—to utter warnings that, if they were appropriate at all, should have been made when the question of participation was first broached. After all, God demands success of none of us; but He does ask that we *try*.

In any event, for weal or for woe, the conference is almost on the eve of assembling. All of the Anglican Churches and most of the Eastern Churches will be represented. Catholic Churchmen are, happily, not holding aloof, nor do most of them share the fears of the *Church Times*. The best thing that all of us can do is to pray earnestly for the blessing of Almighty God upon the conference and its deliberations, and that He will overrule for good any dangers that may, in fact, be involved.

And the more dangerous the matter may be, the more urgent is it that staunch Churchmen at home, whether in America or in England, will sympathetically back up the delegates that have been chosen to represent them.

For the rest, the Holy Spirit is pretty likely to speak the last word, and He still possesses the power to dominate the Church and to lead it still further into all truth.

[From *The Living Church,* Milwaukee, Wis.]

Main Purpose of the World Conference

I HAVE no illusion as to the difficulties which confront all efforts to unite the Christian forces. But in a world of novel intimacies, of insatiable curiosity, of constant interrogation, where scientific inquiry brings to us almost daily new revelations of physical resources, where the opportunities of material progress are of all things the best assured, and where the ulti-

mate question is whether the culture of the spirit will fittingly crown other achievements and justify life itself, we cannot be insensible to the duty to rise above the differences which dissipate spiritual energy and make divisions and antagonisms more impressive than faith. In this, as in everything else, it is the aim that counts. If the aim be worth while, we need but do our best in our time, without distress as to the difficulty of obtaining all that we desire.

Let me suggest that the main purpose of the World Conference is to provide an opportunity for the freest discussion. No one is asked to surrender honest conviction, to sacrifice independence of thought, much less to give up the sincerity without which Christianity would be but a worthless form. But conviction, independent thinking, and sincerity do not gain by combativeness or by the fear which closes the mind. In considering eternal purposes, we can afford to be serene.

The hope of progress in unifying Christian effort lies in the method in which we approach its problems. The more profound we are in our thinking, the more likely we are to get below what is non-essential and to find agreement in the foundations of our faith. My personal view is that the closer we come to the simplicity of the teachings of Jesus the more united we shall be. This Conference is an opportunity for a discussion of questions of Faith and Order—not to conceal disagreements, but to seek common points of view; not to emphasize how much we differ but to ascertain in how much we agree.

Is not this an enterprise which is far above the activities of trade, of industry, and of professional life, which preoccupy us? Can we not at least give our cordial sponsorship to a movement which bears witness to a broader vision, to a measure of emancipation from old prejudices, and to a sincere desire to have the most generous co-operation in man's highest pursuit—in seeking first the Kingdom of God?

[From Hon. Charles Evans Hughes, former American Secretary of State at a Recent Meeting in New York in the Interest of the World Conference on Faith and Order.]

The National Christian Council of China

I COUNT myself fortunate to have arrived in China on the ninth of October, for the National Christian Council of China began its annual meeting in Shanghai, October 13, and thus greeted me with an unusual opportunity to study the problems

facing the church in this country and during these troubled times through the hearts and minds of experts in the missionary enterprise. With Dr. Robert E. Speer and a few others, Mrs. Skevington and I were honoured by official invitation to sit in the Council as guest members without vote.

This was the fourth annual meeting of the Council. It was to have been held last May, but the disturbed conditions then existing led to a postponement to October, though it cannot be said that the delay bettered matters much.

The historical roots of the Council go back less than a score of years to 1907, when the Centenary Missionary Conference was held. At that time not one Chinese delegate was enrolled. Next came the National Conference in 1913, when one-third of the delegates were Chinese. Then in 1922 the N.C.C., as it is always called, came to birth, and the membership was equally divided between Chinese and missionaries. This year, however, 75 per cent of the carefully delegated body of about one hundred members were nationals. Furthermore, two things were evident to the onlooker: (1) The leadership was passing from foreign to native hands; the chairman was Dr. David Z. T. Yui, one of the two secretaries was Dr. C. Y. Cheng, and the chairman of the business committee (the steering committee) was Mr. T. Z. Koo, all three outstanding Chinese Christian scholars of international reputation. (2) The Chinese delegates were assuming full share in the discussion and decision of all matters submitted for consideration and action.

The arrangements for the meetings of the Council are somewhat different from those to which we are accustomed. Each delegate is numbered in registration, wears his numbered badge, and sits at a desk provided for him to which is delivered all reports and printed matter.

The proceedings are all bilingual (English and Mandarin), and duly appointed interpreters translate everything said in one tongue into the other. This is absolutely necessary, but seriously retards the progress of business and grows somewhat wearisome.

The first note struck and struck repeatedly in the earlier sessions of the Council by both Chinese and missionaries, was one of pessimism. The low morale of the Christian forces as they came in from their far scattered stations to this central body was evident. The stress and strain of recent months were showing their effects. True perspectives had been lost; the difficulties loomed insurmountable, and the resources seemed inadequate. But gradually a marked change became manifest.

The trembling minor key was slowly but surely silenced by the triumphant major, and that, not by external mechanics, but by the quiet working of the power of the Spirit of God. It was spiritual. It was of God. The devotional meetings and the consequent victorious spirit of the Council were significant. They were largely under the leadership of Mr. Koo, the upstanding young man to whom was offered at Helsingfors, Finland, last summer, the chairmanship of the international student movement; with him, though unobtrusively, stood Dr. Henry T. Hodgkin, a tower of quiet spiritual strength, whose Quaker influence was plainly felt as the Council was called again and again to periods of impressive silence for personal communion with God as in times of perplexity wisdom was sought from above.

It was not a speech-making conference. Most of the time was given to the study of printed reports of twenty commissions and the findings passed on to the churches for information. There were only three addresses during the whole week, one by Dr. Speer who, by request, gave a masterful analysis of the history of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America; another by Doctor Cheng (who later was called to the general secretaryship of the Council) in which he rang out a mighty appeal to renewed emphasis on the spiritual; and the presidential message of Doctor Yui. This last, which was the first, was a notable utterance, being the outspeaking of the heart of a passionately patriotic Chinese Christian of the first rank at a critical time in the history of his country, both nationally and religiously. In a private interview Doctor Yui told me that usually he spoke on such occasions more or less extemporaneously, but this time he had made a careful and prayerful preparation, writing and reading his speech, both in Chinese and in English, for he had determined to set aside mere platitudes and to call the Council to face the facts as he saw them. He knew that his course would court criticism from those of a contrary point of view; nor was he disappointed, for the leading Shanghai paper editorially condemned his stand.

He dealt with five live issues in setting forth his views of the Christian attitude of the church in China.

(1) Its Kingdom work in a war-torn land with all its dangers and difficulties: Certainly Christianity is not a luxury which we can have and enjoy merely in times of peace and prosperity. We must as Christian soldiers accept the challenge of the hour and march forward with confident hope. The greater

the trouble the harder we should pray and fight. (This, of course, met with universal approval.)

(2) The toleration clauses of the "unequal" treaties: Does Christianity have to depend on such extraordinary and extraneous protection for its propagation and power? No! Whatever may have been necessary in the past, now that religious liberty is written into the constitution of the republic, the Christian movement in China should support the undivided purpose of the Chinese people to abrogate the unequal treaties, including the toleration clauses. This drew fire, first from those who opine that it is not the duty of the Church to meddle in politics, and more from those who, for various reasons and motives, support and defend the obnoxious treaty conditions, at least, until a settled government assures foreign life and property the security and safety expected in a sovereign state. On this issue the Council felt its way carefully and prayerfully for days until it came to complete unanimity in what Doctor Hodgkin called "a spiritual act and not a political resolution" as follows:

"We, collectively and as individuals, place on record our conviction:

1 — That the Christian Church and Christian missions should preach the Gospel and perform Christian service in China upon the basis of religious liberty freely accorded by the republic of China, and that all provisions in the treaties with foreign countries for special privileges for the churches or missions should be removed;

2 — that the present treaties between China and foreign powers should be revised on a basis of freedom and equality;

3 — that we are glad of the steps already taken toward this end by the governments concerned and trust that they may persist in their efforts till satisfactory results have been achieved;

4 — that whatever the historical circumstances which have led to the present state of affairs, it is now the joint responsibility of Chinese and foreigners to see that it is remedied as soon as possible, and that in this task we need the spirit of forbearance, understanding, and love on both sides.

(3) The anti-Christian movement: Here Doctor Yui startled some of us. He said the movement is misnamed as it is not really anti-Christian, certainly not anti-Christ, but is rather "conducting an agitation against those things in Christianity which thoughtful Christians East and West can readily join." It is a movement not to be feared or abused or avoided or counter-attacked, but to be studied, that we may profit by

its attacks, learn what it has to teach us, and try to win and Christianize it.

(4) The coming "Chinese church" as distinguished from the "foreign mission": The spirit of nationalism is running high in every phase of Chinese life, and not the least in the life of the Chinese Christian movement. The "mission" must go and the "church" must come. The transfer will not be easy. It will involve misunderstanding, difficulty, shocks, and painful experiences, but it is inevitable and the "mission" must welcome it and work for it. (While Doctor Yui spoke much of the "Chinese church" he did not mean organic union of all the Christian forces into one body, though in China they are far more advanced in that direction than we are in the West, and it may well be that the church in the East will show the church in the West the way to that which we have not yet known how to plan and achieve in the matter of church union.)

(5) The place of the foreign missionary in the development of the Chinese church: He will certainly continue to have a place. His task will not be done for generations to come. The best and highest gift the West has ever sent to the Orient is the life of the missionary. But he must prepare to occupy a different position. Direction and control must pass from his hands. He must cease being mission-centric and become church-centric. Here Doctor Yui took occasion frankly to point out some of the glaring shortcomings of some missionaries: "(a) A superiority complex and hence a determination to dictate and dominate; (b) a tendency or purpose to transfer and perpetuate in China the practices and experiences of the Christian movements of the West irrespective of the needs over here; (c) too strong nationalism in their attitudes on current questions; and (d) emphasis on external and material things rather than on spiritual life." Nevertheless, he said of the missionary, "We treasure this highest and best of all gifts from the West and plead that this should be made a permanent gift to the Christian movement in China." He closed with this appeal:

"We are not after organic unity or unnatural amalgamation. But under the present circumstances is it not imperative that all the Christian forces in China should knit themselves together in their one common fundamental purpose, work out one general programme calculated to help meet the urgent needs of the Chinese people, and, though each will make a distinct contribution in its own way, co-operate with one another to the best of their ability? Spiritual regeneration and concerted action should be the dominant note in the Christian movement

in China. We must have the courage and confidence to expect extraordinarily great things of God for China to-day, and He will never fail us."

[From Samuel J. Skevington in *The Baptist,* Chicago.]

Unity Conference in Cairo

Mr. Harold de Bildt, the Swedish Minister, who is president of the Fellowship of Unity, recently held a reception at the Swedish Legation at Cairo, which was attended by a large and representative gathering of members of the Fellowship, and included leaders in various branches of the Eastern and Western churches.

The meeting inaugurated the sixth season of the activities of this Fellowship, which aims at producing a closer mutual understanding and friendship between members of the separate sections of Christendom, and of discovering and giving due recognition to that large body of common agreement existing between churches long separated by language, race, or distance. We frankly study our differences together, in an atmosphere of friendship, in order to discover the historical origins of the present points of separation, discern and localize the principles involved and prepare the way, when the time is ripe, for the gradual recovery of organic union.

This meeting was the first occasion on which members of the Women's Fellowship of Unity—a parallel movement with identical aims, now entering upon its second year—held a joint session with the older Fellowship, and they were warmly welcomed. It has been well said that the best shock-absorber of inter-ecclesiastical friction is the mutual friendship of leaders and laity in different churches. If that is so, this gathering can have been hardly less than a triumph. The programme, which was remarkably evenly balanced, had been so arranged as to comprise contributions in seven languages and from many types of Christian tradition. The clearness and rapidity of the interpretations — by precis, not the tedious sentence — sentence method — kept the whole series advancing by a light and rapid movement, unmarred anywhere by excessive length. It was a piece of prescient and consummate chairmanship, for which Mr. de Bildt was heartily congratulated.

The president, in welcoming the members of the Fellowship, said: "What is it that induces us to sacrifice time in order to meet those of either faiths with whom some years ago we

may not have felt much in common? It is because we realize that there is a great common bond—our faith in the same Lord, and our conviction that his Kingdom will draw nearer if his followers draw closer to each other. We should not expect too rapid results. For centuries past our several Christian communities have not felt the importance of close touch with each other. They do now. It is a great and valuable thing to hold spiritual fellowship together. It is an especial pleasure to welcome the members of the Women's Fellowship of Unity, who meet to-day for the first time with the older fraternity. We are happy to have you in our midst and I hope your presence will bring spiritual gifts not obtainable without your piety and your intuition. We all know the influence of a Christian mother's example and prayers. We beg of you to bring to our meetings something of your devotion."

The speaker then read messages from His Beatitude the Patriarch of Alexandria and the new Archbishop of Mount Sinai, Mgr. Porphyrios.

The Greek Patriarch had written "I shall not fail to follow your work, and I express my most ardent wishes for the spreading of a spirit of good-will and unity among the churches, as of understanding and peace among the peoples." Mgr. Porphyrios, who was prevented through an indisposition, had sent a message that he shares the principles and approves the action of our Fellowship. The Primate of the Swedish Church, the Archbishop of Upsala, Mgr. Söderblom, had sent a message as follows: "It would be a real privilege to be present at your retreat. Nothing could be more useful for the furtherance of true fellowship among the disciples of Christ belonging to different traditions, creeds, and temperaments, in the one great flock. Then hearts could open without reserve, and the wonderful discovery be made of our profound unity behind those historic expressions, views, and customs."

In closing the president asked us that if the language difficulty compelled us to hear something that we did not understand, we should look on this as a necessary sacrifice for our cause.

After Rev. Fr. Ibrahim Luka (Coptic Orthodox) and Rev. E. E. Elder (American Presbyterian) had offered prayer, in Arabic and English, and a well known hymn had been sung in unison in three languages, His Grace the Archbishop of Nubia rose to deliver his address. He was present as representing His Holiness, the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Alexandria, Monseigneur Meletios, and conveyed to the meeting the blessings and the good-will of the church of Alexandria.

He expressed its ardent desires for the success of the efforts of this Brotherhood in forming closer relations between the churches, which would certainly lead to mutual benefit, progress, and the advancement of God's Kingdom. By the added strength of such unity, he continued, we shall be able to press the attack against the hosts that would undermine our religion, and destroy the foundations both of the family and of the community.

Almost all churches are now making practical efforts toward the ideal of unity, though there is not at present unanimity as regards the means by which it should be attained. Mutual respect for each other's order of faith and worship is a preliminary necessity. In this way confidence will prevail instead of the suspicion that unity is a method of dissolving and absorbing the ancient historical churches.

The Archbishop then related how he had been present at Geneva in 1920, at the Conference in preparation for the World Conference on Faith and Order, and that all the delegates of the Greek Orthodox Church had demanded in the name of unity that proselytism from the Orthodox Church by emissaries of other denominations must stop—and that the missionaries should bend their efforts to convert those who do not know Christ. The Anglican delegates agreed with this demand; those of other bodies suspended their decision, till the matter be referred to their home churches. On the other hand, a spirit highly favourable to unity has been developed, in the years following the Great War, by the action of relief workers, sent from the Confederation of American churches, for the relief of child destitution, with no attempt at proselytism. This work has called forth very widespread admiration.

There are other circumstances in which the question of church membership arises, as for instance, in South or Central Africa, where Orthodox members live at a great distance from their own priests, and apply to those of another church for marriage, baptism, or other ministrations. What principle is to be followed in these cases? The answer was given by the memorable Patriarch Photios last year when he met the Archbishop of Canterbury and other church dignitaries in London. He quoted the wonderful position taken upon this matter by Bishop Blyth of Palestine, who would not receive Orthodox members into the Anglican Church, whenever they offered themselves, not because they had confidence in the English church, but through disputes with their own. His rule was that the non-Orthodox minister should refer such people to the nearest authority of their own church, and only with the permission of

this authority would he give them the ministrations they desired.

But in the East there is another kind of proselytism, which occurs between the various sections of the Eastern churches and also between them and those of the West. I refer to cases where those who wish to contract a marriage, or obtain a divorce contrary to the rule of their own church, seek refuge elsewhere in order to facilitate matters. The denomination which agrees to accept such applicants and facilitate their wishes, knows perfectly well that their motive is not in agreement with this church's teaching, for it is observed that after they have obtained what they want from their new church, they never have anything more to do with it. Both Christian love, and the well being of the whole Church, demand that denominations should not undersell each other's moral standards and discipline in such ways as this.

The greatest need of the churches in Egypt is mutual respect and mutual help. In this way they will be raised to a higher standing and inspire confidence. This mutual help and respect is a vital preliminary for the work of unity, for the study of whose conditions we are met.

The Rev. Ibrahim Said (Egyptian Presbyterian) in proposing a vote of thanks said: "It is my own conviction that unity is a fundamental doctrine and element in Christianity. To me it is beyond question, because it is a spiritual fact established by Christ Himself. He made the Church one. It is not our duty to make unity, but to make it manifest. It is not our duty to create it, but to keep it, as St. Paul expresses it, 'endeavouring to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.' Our duty then is to express unity by union."

The Evangelical Church has a much more honourable mission than proselytizing, and that is the evangelizing of the world. The Bishop of Chicago gave striking expression to a truth when he declared that, instead of saying I am a member of the invisible Church because I belong to one of the visible churches, I should say I am a member of the visible Church, because there are no "visible churches."

Those are apt words of a great Christian doctor:—"A whole Bible for my creed, a whole Christ for my salvation, a whole church for my mother, and a whole world for my parish."

At this point the unity in diversity of the gathering was very clearly manifested by short readings from Scripture in Coptic, Arabic, Greek, Armenian, English, and Swedish. The strikingly suitable passage in Jeremiah 32, verses 39-41, selected

by the Swedish Minister for his reading, was adapted in several other languages.

The conference then heard with deep interest a beautiful address in French, by Archbishop Thorgom, of the Armenian Church. After expressing his deep satisfaction and gratitude to H. E. the Swedish Minister for his practical solicitude for this great movement toward reunion, he said, "It is my deep conviction that all the existing churches are but fragments of the great Church Universal. And the most ancient churches, like those of more recent date—all aspire toward union with profound sincerity. This principle of union is the polar star, toward which all are looking. This same aspiration animates the Armenian Church, and it is expressed in our worship, in our creed, and, above all, in our life. Peace is an essential condition of the Church's wellbeing and fruitfulness. Yet peace itself is the fruit of love, which unites men and peoples in brotherhood, and is the light of conscience. The Church, the main instrument for the realization of the Kingdom of God upon earth, needs peace above all else: in other words, first love, then faith—first the moral and then the metaphysical. Ecclesiastical union, or it would be truer to say, human brotherhood itself conceived in the evangelical sense, is rather a moral fellowship than a dogmatic one. By this shall all men know that you are my disciples, if you love one another. Yes, it is not in the elaboration of an increasingly abstract system of religious metaphysic that union can be achieved. The history of Christianity proves to us the truth of this statement. Dogmatic questions have seldom drawn churches together, or rather they have brought them together only to separate them further. That is certainly not tantamount to saying that religious thought and definition is a superfluous luxury to faith. No. None can deny the part that truth is called to fulfil in the life of faith. But the main reason why union in the matter of faith has not been realized in the past is because it has not been approached by the way of love. Every church needs, if only for a space, to emancipate itself from fetters fastened upon it by history, environment, party, race, and other more or less material calculations; fetters binding it in solitary confinement since that sad day when antagonism fastened upon dogma and broke in pieces the unity of Christendom.

"Fuller fellowship and more mutual knowledge will generate this fuller love. Mutual ignorance only perpetuates indifference. Every age has had its greatness, and every church its role in the expansion of Christianity. Who would not recognize the prodigious activity of the Roman Church, through or-

ganization, moral power, and missionary energy? Or the glorious activity of the Greek Orthodox Church in its clear thinking and definition of doctrine, and in the achievements of its monastic life centuries ago. Or the service rendered by Copt and Syrian to the whole Church through the wealth of their exegetic literature and the writings of the Fathers. Or the spiritual enlightenment of the Anglican Church, which has caused it to embark upon the best and most practical way of mediation between the ancient and the younger churches. Or the energy and wisdom shown by Protestantism, for example, in the tendency in American Christianity to animate all aspects of life by the breath of the Gospel. As to the Armenian Church, I leave it to others to evaluate her whose entire life for above sixteen centuries has been one ceaseless holocaust on the altar of Christianity. Each church has still its mission, and its peculiar genius. The great synthesis is being formed from the gifts and services of all Christians: each church has, as the Apostle says, its gift 'for the building up of the Body of Christ.' "

Dr. Faris Nimr, in proposing a cordial vote of thanks to the last speaker, said that he had as a young man left the church of his ancestors, for none of such reasons as marriage, etc., but with the conviction that it would be better for him to do so. He knew that others were actuated by the same motive. Yet there were reasons later which brought regret, because he felt that he had lost his influence with his own people. If he wished to ask for a reform he was told that he belonged to another church. And many others shared this experience. Then, he continued, under the leadership of the great pioneer, Dr. Vandyk, we began to think if it were possible to leave one sect and join the one Church. The difficulty was not on the side of us laymen, but more on that of the clergy. That was many years ago. Thank God, now I see another spirit and outlook, and prelates speak with so fine a spirit as the address we have now heard. Only love will bring back the unity of the first centuries of the Church. My faith in the cause of Christian unity is much stronger than before.

In conclusion, the company rose and the Lord's prayer was said unitedly, in the various languages, after which Bishop Gwynne pronounced the blessing. Warm thanks were expressed to H. E. the Swedish Minister both for his hospitality and for his brilliant chairmanship and interpretation. Arabic precis had also been ably and rapidly given by Mitry Effendi Salib.

Those present included, besides those mentioned as taking part in the programme, Prof. and Mrs. MacClenahan, Mme.

Fahmy Bey Wissa, M. Antoine Pezas, Judge and Mme. Vryakos, Dr. Hume, Lady Willcocks, Mr. and Mrs. Janig Chaker, Dr. and Mrs. Harpur, Mme. Halim Bey Fanous, Dr. Kyrtsonis, Dr. A. Zahos, Rev. A. Toop, Dr. W. Eddy, and many others.

If this brief conference had concluded no decision that can be tabulated, yet it had drawn together representatives, both cleric and lay, of religious communities who but ten years ago were not meeting. In its atmosphere divisive problems and conflicting points of view were rationally and quietly stated, in a spirit too deep, and too high, and too scientific to be thrown off its balance by them. They constitute some of the very problems of inheritance that Christians almost the world over are bending their mind and heart to solve.

[From Rev. M. H. Richard in Daily Paper, Cairo, Egypt.]

Christian Council of India, Burma, and Ceylon

THE National Christian Council of India, Burma, and Ceylon, representing all non-Roman Catholic churches and missions in India, has just concluded its biennial meeting in Calcutta under the presidency of the Most Rev. the Metropolitan of India. Sixty-five members attended, including the bishops of Bombay and Madras. The subjects considered included the attitude of the Christian Church toward communal rivalry, industrial development, opium reform, and primary education.

In an appeal to Christians the Council says:

The National Christian Council of India, Burma, and Ceylon cannot but view with apprehension and dismay the growth of communal feeling and communal strife in all parts of India, which has resulted in an appalling number of riots during the last three and a half years and in the death or injury of over 3,000 persons. Christians, whom the Council specially addresses, must recognize with penitence and shame that they cannot claim to have done all that they should have done to promote peace and to remove the underlying causes of communal strife. They themselves have often not been free from the spirit which breeds such strife. The Council need hardly remind them that it is their special duty and privilege to follow measures that make for peace both among themselves and among others. It should be their endeavour to use every opportunity of bringing together in friendly intercourse members of opposing factions, and, above all, they should offer continual

prayers to God for the gift of the spirit of reasonableness and love. The Council recognizes that the underlying causes of tension and disunion are deep and complex, and it suggests that plans might be adopted in different places for the study of those underlying causes and of possible means of their removal.

The Council also believes that Christian educational institutions can make a large contribution to the growth of peace and friendship by taking practical steps to develop in the children or students habits of friendly intercourse with those who belong to other religions or communities.

The Council says disunion is based upon selfishness, and it is only the power of the ideals of the Kingdom of God which can remove the fundamental causes of strife. Even patriotism is not enough. Christians should, therefore, pray and work with redoubled zeal at this time for the coming with power of the spirit of Christ in India.

[From *The Indian Social Reformer,* Bombay.]

Reflections on Reunion

PSYCHOLOGICALLY it was inevitable that the years following the Great War should have been productive of many theories for the reunion of Western Christendom. It was part of the general reaction away from strife and dissension in favour of universal peace. Theory after theory was propounded.

First of all, there was a brief revival of Bishop Gore's picturesque appeal to the "undivided church" of antiquity as a basis of negotiation, until it came to be recognized that there is no general agreement amongst non-Catholics as to *when* the church of antiquity was supposed to have become divided, and that each disputant was disposed to draw the line of division at that point in history which suited his own particular theory best. Meantime Catholics merely pointed out that unity is an essential mark of the Church of Christ which, consequently, always was, is, and will be undivided. Clearly this avenue could lead only to an *impasse.*

Next came the popular proposal for a League of Churches modeled on the League of Nations. Reunion was to be brought about, apparently, by finding the best common denominator of "Christian belief," not as it was in antiquity, but as it is in England at any given moment. This democratic movement, based on a false analogy between religion and politics, collapsed utterly when certain old-fashioned people declared that they

did not consider themselves at liberty to bargain and barter with regard to the deposit of revealed truth.

At this stage, if not earlier, the Modernist took a hand, with an earnest plea for the simple unity of negation. His appeal was to "Christian consciousness," inner experience, and the subjective values of Christianity, until it became painfully obvious that this method of approach led ultimately to the denial of nearly every article of the historic Christian creed.

During all this period of striving for a formula which would unite discordant elements, Catholic apologists were not idle. They made many notable contributions to the study of the vexed problems of reunion, and put forward suggestions which were by no means unfruitful.

But, to-day, interest in the question of reunion is at a low ebb. Cardinal Mercier is dead. The Anglican Bishop of Zanzibar is dead. The question that was uppermost in the minds of these two great men seems shelved. In fact, Canon Maynard Smith, in his recent biography, *Frank, Bishop of Zanzibar,* says: "At present reunion is not desired either at Rome or in England, except by a very few; and until the desire is much more general nothing is likely to happen" (p. 307). In a letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, written on October 25th, 1925, even the lion-hearted Cardinal Mercier confesses that, as a result of the Malines conversations, "the difficulties in the way of final success loom larger on the horizon and the reasons for hoping seem less convincing" (*Cardinal Mercier,* by Georges Goyau, p. 10). Are all prospects of reunion vanishing into thin air?

I venture to think that the desire for reunion is still as ardent as ever in the breasts of thousands of Catholics and thousands of Anglicans, but that many enthusiasts have been chilled into inactivity by the failure of their own well-meant efforts and by the criticism of candid friends. How Cardinal Mercier, with his delicate, finely-fibred susceptibilities must have wilted under some of the "friendly" criticisms! He himself has left on record an analysis of "restlessness" of Catholics whose knowledge of the happenings at Malines was necessarily gained from outside the meetings. The optimists, he says in effect, in their eagerness are impatient of all delays and brush aside every obstacle; whilst the pessimists (who are always with us) "exaggerate purposely the difficulties."

He must, indeed, be a small-minded man who cannot see that such discussions as those at Malines have a value beyond their present achievement. Men of good-will cannot meet and

thresh out the most intimate and personal of all subjects without, in some way, being drawn very near together. It is surely something gained if, in such an atmosphere, they become mutually clear to the doctrinal points of departure. At the very least the problem is not left in quite such a tangle for posterity.

It is so much easier to criticize than to contribute anything of positive value that most of us are inclined to send barbed darts from afar at all committees, commissions, and cabinets. I once heard a man of vast experience in many fields of endeavour describe criticism as "the misadventures of mediocrities amongst masterpieces." Who will deny the truth in the witticism? The fact is that not a few critics have neglected to qualify themselves for the role they have assumed.

I am moved to these reflections by my week's reading. On the one hand, I have read some acrimonious strictures on the "Church of Rome," by a cultured gentleman who must surely have lost his temper, and also a denunciation of Anglicanism in all its moods and tenses which leaves little to be desired from the standpoint of invective. On the other hand, I have read the lives of Cardinal Mercier and the Bishop of Zanzibar, and I cannot help thinking how well it would be if we could all adopt the attitude of these two great protagonists of reunion, who spent themselves unto death in its cause.

"Reunion is not our work and we may be unable to achieve it," says the Cardinal of Malines, *"but it is within our power, and consequently within our duty to prepare it and pave the way for it."* Of the Bishop of Zanzibar his biographer tells us how, at the Lambeth Conference of 1920 A.D., he strove might and main that nothing should be done *"to make reunion with the great Church of the West more difficult than it is." O si sic omnes!*

The outlook, the temper, and the prejudices of four hundred years of Protestantism are not likely to disappear suddenly nor at any one's stern bidding. Humanly speaking, to Catholicize England is a gigantic work of re-education, that is to say, a work requiring the patience of the pedagogue and the tact of the teacher. If reunion is to come in these, our troubled days, it can be only through the special grace of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, which in the past has turned full many an earthly failure into a spiritual triumph. May some such special grace be vouchsafed to our fellow-countrymen of good-will without the fold.

[From Rev. Richard Downey in *The Catholic Times,* London.]

The Baptists and Church Union

PROPOSALS:

1. Let all local churches, of whatever denomination, in order to safeguard the Christian character and spirituality of the local churches and denominations entering into the union, require of each and every candidate for full, active membership credible evidence of Christian faith, Christian experience, and a Christian life-purpose, such evidence to include the candidate's own statement, even when he comes with a letter of dismission from another local church, whether of the same or of a different denomination.

2. In connection with a candidate's personal statement of Christian faith, let it be understood that the local church receiving the candidate does not necessarily endorse his creedal statement, but simply judges his faith, in the sense of his religious attitude, to be essentially Christian.

3. While local churches, groups of churches, and denominations may adopt or retain such forms as they may choose, whether of creedal statement, internal organization, or ritual, including such symbolical rites as baptism, the Lord's Supper, and ordination, let it be understood that neither any such form nor the lack of it shall constitute a barrier to inclusion within the united church organization, the one and only indispensable condition of such inclusion being, besides a desire to be included, credible evidence of Christian faith, experience, and purpose.

4. Let a united Christian Church, or organic union of denominations be organized by accredited representatives, duly authorized to act in this capacity, it being understood that such union will leave the distinctive features of each uniting denomination intact, except as modifications may be made at the time or later by denominations, groups of churches, or single local churches themselves.

5. Let such local unions of different denominational churches be formed as may seem desirable and possible to the local churches concerned.

6. Let such district, state or provincial, national, and international organizations of the united church be formed as may seem desirable, the delegates to meetings of such general bodies being given only an executive and advisory function with reference to the component local or denominational bodies.

7. Let a division of duties and functions between the general bodies of the united church and the general bodies of the

component denominations be arranged by mutual agreement. That is, let the general body or bodies of the united church assume, if they wish, such functions as may be delegated to them by the denominations, in harmony with the constitutions of those denominations, and let the general body or bodies of the united church also be free to suggest to the component denominations that they assign to the united church certain functions, leaving it to the denominations to accept or reject any such suggestion.

The above recommendations, it is believed, state the essential conditions of a satisfactory union of Christian denominations. The probable result of union on this basis would be the increasing importance of the united body and its acts, and the diminishing significance of the component denominations as distinct and separate units. The analogy of the United States is instructive. In order, however, that the united church, once organized, might increase, and undue denominationalism decrease, the following additional recommendations may be suggested:

8. Let all churches observing the rite of the Lord's Supper practice open communion, or, in other words, impose no condition of participation save the spiritual condition of a genuine Christian discipleship.

9. Let letters of dismission be granted by the local church to members in good standing who may wish to unite with a church of another denomination.

10. Let local churches receive members by letter from other denominations and by personal testimony, as provided in the first recommendations above, impose no absolute requirement on such members either as to ritual act or as to creedal subscription.

[From Professor Douglas Clyde Macintosh in *The Crozer Quarterly,* Crozer, Pa.]

There Must Be a Better Way

It would be perfectly useless for any denomination of this present day to try to evade the question of Christian unity. It is in the air, and anyone who is alive to his own times simply has to breathe it and relate himself to it in one way or another. And the same thing is true of denominations. If they are at all alive to our own times, they simply must face in some sort of a way the intolerable situation that is brought about by denomi-

national division and the insurmountable obstacles such division puts in the way of the Kingdom in thousands of communities and in practically every great problem with which the Church has to deal to-day either at home or abroad. For a denomination not to be alive to this situation and try to relate itself to it in some intelligent and helpful manner is to pronounce its own doom. That is inevitable. Something must be done about this question of denominational division, and something is going to be done about it whether we will or no. Denominations have no choice in that matter. Their only choice is whether or not they will accept the inevitable wisely and try to relate themselves to it in a helpful manner or whether they will persist in trying to block the sure movements of God. Nothing is plainer in Christendom to-day than that the movement is under way, and that it will slowly but surely work mighty reformation in this matter of church division. Every year sees more being said upon the subject in religious and secular periodicals, in books and treatises, from pulpit and platform. The laymen down in the communities which suffer most from overchurched conditions are becoming more and more impatient with the loss which they and their communities are asked to bear simply in order to keep their little denominational churches alive. The thinking, energizing youth of to-day are setting their faces against denominational division to an extent and with an impulse that were never known before since first division came about. Something different is coming. That is as sure as fate. The only question is what we, as individuals and as denominations, are going to do about it.

Another thing that is certain is that the outcome is as yet very uncertain. No one can tell just how soon it will arrive or what course the movement will have taken. We are in the most confused state, denominationally, that the Church has ever known; and there is a tremendous amount of superficial and confused thinking on the subject. Formerly denominational lines were closely drawn and very rigid, and denominational loyalties were supreme and easily maintained. Now denominational lines have been practically effaced, so far as distinctive differences are concerned, and people pass from one church to the other readily. The spirit of sectarian dogmatism is dying out and denominational loyalties are hard to maintain. In fact, they should not be maintained in the old-fashioned way, but only as loyalties to working organizations in order to prevent the actual disintegration of Christian forces until something better can take the place of our present going concerns—

the latter being a truth which some union enthusiasts do not seem to see is an imperative necessity if the Christian cause is not to suffer dreadfully in this day of transition.

[From *The Herald of Gospel Liberty,* Dayton, O.]

As a Jew Sees It

UNDER the caption, "The Lost Accord," the Cincinnati *Enquirer* recently had a powerful editorial from which the following paragraphs are selected:

Creeds, schisms, dogmas—these have usurped the throne of Religion until there no longer is a general, unified faith among the alleged followers of Christ throughout the earth. They quarrel, dispute, wrangle, draw away their garments from each other, lest they become contaminated. In many aspects they preach heaven and exemplify its antithesis. They proclaim light and spread a darkness more profound over the minds and souls of men. They have, persistently, refused to come together. Shall they ever come together?

The Enquirer then proceeds to answer its own question:

Perhaps the lost accord may be regained. There is to be a great Protestant Church conference at Geneva this summer to discuss the feasibility of amalgamating Protestant sects. The Church of England and the two great divisions of the Catholic faith for long have been endeavouring to get together. Shall these, along with the Protestants, find any basis of unity? Shall the Protestants at Geneva do any more than they have done in the past, talk and quibble over what should be the gravest problem in the world? If the majority of these warring sects are right, hell is and shall be crowded to its brazen confining boundaries with souls damned because they fought and believed themselves to have been worthy and sincere followers of Christ.

It is greatly to be feared that no such beautiful accord can be arrived at so long as the first interest of the Protestant churches is theocratic government. Dogma and democracy won't mix. But aside from that, has anyone even suggested a common ground on which the various Protestant denominations can meet?

An effort in this direction was made in this country some years ago that got as far as the selection of a name, "The World Federation of the Churches of Christ," and that is practically

all that remains of it, if we except a sort of census bureau and headquarters for religio-civil legislation propaganda.

Before the Protestant churches of the world undertake to resurrect "The Lost Accord" it would seem that two things must happen: there must be a single definite objective grounded on practice, not preachments, and the individual organizations must establish concord and unity among themselves and within themselves. There must be no Methodist Church North and Methodist Church South; no Northern Baptists and Southern Baptists; no fundamentalist Presbyterians and modernist Presbyterians, etc., *ad fin.* And what is to become of the Unitarians, the Mormons, the Christian Scientists, and innumerable other Christian sects that are not in harmony with the Protestant Christianity of this day and generation and who were barred from the original compact?

In Europe there are three times as many Catholics as there are Protestants, and in the entire world there are twice as many non-Christians as there are Christians of all creeds, sects, and denominations combined.

We talk glibly enough of a "Yellow Peril" and a "Red Peril" and perils of various degrees and kinds, all more or less the unfortunate fruits of accords in one or another form; is it not possible that "The Lost Accord," if ever found and re-established, might contain potentialities for even greater evils than those *The Enquirer* has so eloquently ascribed to the Christianity of the past? Candidly, is there anything in the history of mankind in the past twenty centuries that would be considered worth while to-day!

[From *The American Israelite,* Cincinnati.]

Local Church Co-operation

THERE may be some question as to the readiness of any local community for the actual merging of its churches; but certainly in this day and age there ought to be no question whatever in any community about the readiness of its pastors and churches to co-operate in every possible way. And yet how comparatively few are the local communities in which any large measure of actual co-operation is being practiced among the churches—or in which there is even any conspicuous general willingness for such co-operation.

Denominational officials come in for a good deal of scutching these days for "blocking" the union of local churches; but it has been our observation that there are mighty few communities in which there are not church leaders—and they are not all old folks either, by any means—who are more stubbornly resisting the union of their churches than are their denominational officials. One thing is sure, the local constituency have the matter in their own hands and can unite when they have a united mind to do so, regardless of what denominational officials shall say. But it is foolish to talk union among churches which cannot co-operate and which feel no unity of purpose or common responsibility toward their own community. In such cases, the creation of a community consciousness rather than a "parish-mindedness" is an absolute necessity, not only as a forerunner of union but also as an imperative in any adequate work for the Kingdom. The Federal Council urges such local co-operation, and in its findings says:

> In spite of substantial advance in many communities, in the majority there is no adequate programme of community co-operation and no satisfactory progress. "We need reducing exercises to reduce the unwieldy bulk of parish-mindedness." Such parish-mindedness prevents a recognition of the value of acting together, as we must act, if we are ever to meet our whole responsibility.
>
> Three duties confront all community religious leaders, denominational and interdenominational. Each must (*a*) keep his eye on the inclusive task of Christianizing the whole community, especially on the full Protestant part of the task; (*b*) be willing to confer; (*c*) sacrificially adjust his own plans to the point of minimum conflict and of maximum co-operation. We can never achieve our Protestant task until we have a common Protestant strategy. "There is a federal paganism in America which we can meet only by a federal Christianity."
>
> A number of our communions have reached high-water mark in Christian education and in giving, but still more notably in evangelism. All three of these Christian activities can be tabulated and all show substantial gains. We pay just tribute to the effectiveness of Roman Catholic organizations in each of these fields. We often assume that Protestant churches are falling far behind in their part of the community task. The facts are the reverse.
>
> Councils of Churches should see to it that religious education is at the heart of the community religious programme; and that in addition to the Sunday-schools the newer activities—among which are week-day religious schools, the vacation schools, the church-night institutes, the children's church, and adequate teacher-training courses—are promoted and fostered.

[From *The Herald of Gospel Liberty,* Dayton, O.]

Faith and Order

Some time ago the Archbishop of Canterbury speaking to the Upper House of Convocation of Canterbury upon the participation of the Church of England in the coming World

Conference on Faith and Order, said "It is hardly necessary that I should urge on this House the vital importance of our bestowing on this great matter the keenest attention to some points of special interest connected with the Conference. Its official title puts Faith before Order, and it has been largely interpreted as a call to churches conscious of possessing a common Faith and severed, in the main, only by differences of Order. Hence, in the preparatory work for the Conference, the main stress has been laid upon matters of organization rather than upon matters of belief. But the scheme has now reached the stage at which the problems of Faith are re-asserting themselves. . . . "

A year ago the Continuation Committee, meeting then at Stockholm, issued draft agenda arranged in order to avoid the Charybdis of aimless and unguided talk into which, in 1920, the preliminary meeting at Geneva fell; this plan was backed by a decision of the Continuation Committee that the speaking at Lausanne should be "to definite propositions." In this scheme the Continuation Committee has now made drastic alterations. It has added one new subject—"The Church's message to the World—The Gospel"—in order that an assertion of common faith may precede the discussion of the place of the ancient creeds in a reunited Church. But it has also rescinded the order about "definite propositions," and decided that the actual programme of the Conference shall contain specified subjects only, a revised version of the old agenda being appended to it, "together with any further material simply as suggestive of questions which must naturally arise in any thorough consideration of the general subject."

The motives for this serious reversal of policy are easily explained. In Germany, as well as in America, the draft agenda had failed to make themselves understood. They had been taken, rather naturally, as tending to predetermine the findings of the Conference, and, quite inexcusably, as a set of excessively Anglican official judgments. Now the Conference is in origin an American venture, and the bare possibility of holding it depends in large measure upon American sympathy and financial help. America, however, has not followed with any close attention the course of reunion movements in the old world, and found itself wholly uninterested in agenda based largely upon the course of discussions with which it was unfamiliar. In particular, American opinion cares very little for such proposals for a universally recognized ministry as have emerged from the Lambeth discussions. Transatlantic opinion, there-

fore, has found it impossible to take the draft agenda seriously as data for discussion, or to pay due attention to the carefully guarded clauses. The material prepared by the Subjects Committee will still appear in official documents—this concession, at least, it was found possible to secure—but in a subordinate place; and it is hoped that, by the new arrangement, all danger of misunderstanding will be averted.

This hope we would fain share. But a great burden of responsibility will now be thrown upon the presiding officers of the Conference at Lausanne. It will be their duty to see that the discussions, freed as they will be from the limitations of definite agenda, are rightly and intelligently guided. And it will be the first duty of all members of the Conference to seek that spirit of mutual trust, unselfishness, and hope in which alone their difficult task can be rightly approached.

[From *The Guardian,* London.]

Need of Mutual Education

In answering the question why unity is not "just around the corner," I should be inclined to say two things:

1. Because programmes, schemes, etc., have displaced the study of questions of Faith and Order—the cart before the horse.

2. Because the hindrances lie in these questions, and until what may prove to be a lengthy process of mutual education has been successfully accomplished, no reunion between Nonconformist and Anglican (not to say other Catholic) churches can be had that will not end in fiasco.

One more thought: We have talked a good deal about "agreement." That is, of course, a *sine qua non* in matters believed by the several groups of Christians to be vital. But there is a premise that ought to be more frequently expressed. It is that we should not only agree, but our agreement should accord with Christ's teaching and arrangements for his Church. In other words, while seeking to understand each other, our motive should be common attainment to the true answers on vital questions of Faith and Order.

[From Rev. Francis J. Hall, New York, in a letter to the Secretariat of the World Conference on Faith and Order.]

Unity as a Missionary End

It is with no sectarian bias, but with the desire to see the full weight of Christianity in co-operative mood pressing upon the unevangelized world that I would consider the future. I began my address by quoting words ascribed to our Lord in St. John's Gospel * as having been uttered by Him just before Gethsemane, words which I would remark do not lose in significance or power if we place the date of St. John's Gospel as late as historical criticism will allow—indeed the wonder that any one could think of such a thing but Christ and at the time indicated is intensified. Twice He prays for the unity of the Church, a mystical unity like to that which unites Him to the Father so that each is lost in each, *for a missionary end*—"that the world may believe that thou hast sent me"; and again, "that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me." Unity is in itself a beautiful thing. But our Lord would have it, not to bask in its beauty, but for its power to create that simple faith in Him which is salvation. The wrangling of a thousand voices which characterizes our Christianity blights where it does not blast, and, in the eyes of the sceptically inclined, the Church stands as a Kingdom divided against itself. Not only the words of Christ but also practical experience tells us the sad truth that rival Christian faiths largely nullify the power of Christian missions. That rivalry is not as acute as it was. The Edinburgh Conference of 1910 stirred the churches to a more co-operative mind. But the fact abides that, because of the lack of solidarity of Christians around Christ, colour is lent to such an assertion as Dean Inge makes:

> Organized religion is not, in modern times, one of the strongest forces in human affairs. As compared with patriotism and revolutionary aims, it has shown itself lamentably weak. The strength of Christianity is in transforming the lives of individuals—of a small minority certainly, as Christ clearly predicted, but a large number in the aggregate. To rescue a little flock, here and there, from materialism, selfishness and hatred, is the task of the Church in all ages alike, and there is no likelihood that it will ever be otherwise.†

I would indeed lament to accept Dean Inge's words as representing a fixed condition in which we must acquiesce, or to subscribe to his gloomy forecast. How ill it fits in with that trumpet call to go and make disciples of all nations with which the Gospel closes! It does, however, describe the actual position

---

* Chapter xvii. 20-23.
† *Science, Religion and Reality*, p. 388.

of sectarian and broken Christianity, a condition which it is impossible to accept as being in accord with the mind of Christ. But let us, before we attack our immediate duty of evangelization, at least face the situation as Christ would have it and dispose our efforts accordingly.

As being essential to the effective operation of missionary forces: (1) the Church must be at one with itself, and (2) its home constituency must exhibit a higher type of Christian life and character.

1. The great missionary age of the Church closed with the Reformation. It closed because of the Reformation. With the era of civil war within the Church, local and home concerns obscured and prevented attention to the spread of the Kingdom of God in the uttermost parts of the earth. Christianity became self-conscious and the sectarian took the place of the catholic spirit throughout Christendom. The condition of Christianity demanded moral and spiritual reformation, but the process brought with it inevitable evils, not the least of which was the dying down of the missionary fires. The Roman Catholic Church was the first to revive. Thanks to the religious orders mission work had never ceased, though it had fallen to a low ebb in morals and spirituality. The Brothers Minor had continued their work in the Holy Land where they had been since St. Francis' visit in 1219. Foothold was maintained in China where Latin Christianity was established in 1293. Work in South America was begun in 1542, and St. Francis Xavier began his work in Japan in 1549. But it was not until 1622 that mission work took that central position in the Roman Catholic Church which it has held ever since. At that time Gregory XV. founded the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith whose missionaries in every country to-day number 12,712 priests, 4,015 indigenous priests, 4,018 lay helpers, 832 indigenous lay helpers, 24,102 sisters, 11,158 indigenous sisters, and 65,641 catechists and teachers. The massive unity—whether it is of a sort we do not like is not to the point—of the Roman Catholic Church is not considered as subsidiary but is maintained to validate and promote the Church's missionary character. Nor is her missionary character considered a side issue or a voluntary matter for a group of enthusiasts. It is of the woof and fibre of the Church. The devotion and self-sacrifice of her missionaries give cause for thanksgiving throughout the whole of Christendom.

It was not until a later date that the various national and sectarian churches took up their missionary responsibility—the Church of England by the S.P.C.K. in 1698, and by the S.P.G. in 1701, beginning in her own colonies; in 1732 the Moravians in their Mission to the West Indian slaves; the Presbyterians in 1795, under the stimulus of William Carey, blossoming out as a great missionary church; the Baptists in 1792, and the numerous other sects following. The nineteenth century was the greatest missionary century since the Reformation and planted sectarian churches of every sort the world over. Then with the Edinburgh Missionary Conference in 1910 began the introduction of that attempt to reach mutual understanding, to eliminate a cut-throat policy and to establish such measure of co-operation as could be conscientiously adopted. That is where we now stand, and the limit of our possibilities in the *status quo* is where Dean Inge places them. It is a situation which must cause profound dissatisfaction and alarm. The cry everywhere is for unity and the Church must lead. There are at least some few things which we can do looking toward the day when there will be one flock under One Shepherd. We can take into our hearts the promise of the "Spiritual *Entente*":

> I will seek, with the aid of our Lord, to meet every Christian as brother. I will strive, by opening my own soul to God's grace, to find Him in the soul of every Christian, and to treat with reverence his form of worship.

We can avoid all unnecessary controversy. We can shed the spirit of proselytism. The Church of England has ever refrained her hand from countries under Latin domination except where she has imperial obligations or is called upon to minister to her own people. We can know and reach an understanding of our brethren on the right hand and on the left and draw them to us and us to them by the unfailing bands of love. We can hold fast to the ideal of unity as expressed in the Lambeth Appeal. We can at least be as generously minded as St. Paul, who said:

> Some indeed preach Christ even of envy and strife; and some also of goodwill. . . . What then? Notwithstanding, every way, whether in pretence, or in truth, Christ is preached; and I therein do rejoice, yea, and will rejoice.*

We can be thankful for the missionary work done by others in that were it not done by them it would not be done at all. And might we not all join together in the acceptance of the Festival of Christ the King as the supreme Missionary day of the year?

---

* Phil. i. 15, 18.

2. I need not dwell on the second necessity — that we should covet a higher type of Christian living in our own home constituency. When Gandhi, himself a product of Christianity, who is more Christian in life than most professing Christians, replied to the question "What would you suggest to make possible the naturalization of Christianity in India?" he very gravely and thoughtfully replied:

> I would suggest first, that all of you Christians, missionaries and all, must begin to live more like Jesus Christ. . . . Second, I would suggest that you must practice your religion without adulterating or toning it down. . . . Third, I would suggest that you must put your emphasis upon love, for love is the center and soul of Christianity.†

So the evangelized becomes to us the evangelist stirring us to rise in our strength.

We become zealous in sharing only that which is so precious to us that it is our life and joy. I can quite understand flagging missionary zeal among those who are mildly inoculated with Christianity and consequently immune from its passionate reality. No longer is it that we desire to save the heathen from perishing in a future life, but that we yearn to share with them that which is our royal and inestimable heritage on earth. The Christianity I accept is not that maimed and feeble thing which is characteristic of the West. I accept the Christ and the catholic religion which He founded. It must be one, not divided. It must be holy, not mediocre. It must be catholic, not sectarian. It must be missionary, not self-centered.

Increasingly this estimate of religion is what the S.P.G. stands for. For that reason it merits the support of the church which it has so loyally served. This anniversary is of such note that it should be signalized by an immediate response to the appeal for added funds. The £30,000 increase in contributions for general purposes which the Society places in the forefront of its appeals might fittingly come as a thankoffering for God's blessing showered abundantly on the Society during two and a quarter centuries of its life.

We are living in a perplexing moment of history. No one can see far ahead. But no organization which has such clear evidences as the S.P.G. has of the presence of the Holy Spirit in all its operations has reason to doubt or to fear. Let us therefore gird ourselves anew to do the King's business.

[From Bishop Charles H. Brent in a recent address at Westminster Abbey in *The East and the West,* London.]

---

† *The Christ of the Indian Road,* pp. 118, 119.

A Joint Statement on Interchurch Relations from the Commissions of the Congregational and Universalist Churches

THE National Council of Congregational Churches and the Universalist General Convention, at their sessions held in October, 1925, referred to the Congregational Commission on Interchurch Relations and to the Universalist Commission on Christian Comity and Unity certain proposals looking toward closer fellowship. The members of these commissions, after fraternal conference and discussion, join in issuing the following statement:

We believe that the basis of vital Christian unity is a common acceptance of Christianity as primarily a way of life. It is faith in Christ expressed in a supreme purpose to do the will of God as revealed in Him and to co-operate as servants of the Kingdom for which He lived and died. Assent to an official creed is not essential. Within the circle of fellowship created by loyalty to the common Master, there may exist differences of theological opinion. With that primary loyalty affirmed, such differences need not separate; rather, indeed, if the mind of the Master controls, they may enrich the content of faith and experience; and if it does not control, theological agreements will not advance the Christian cause. "Religion to-day does not grow in the soil of creeds."

The unity of a common loyalty to the Christian way of life is already a fact, to which the high task in which we are now engaged is witness. Not only Congregationalists and Universalists, but multitudes of other forward-looking Christians, share this unity of faith and endeavour. It is not something to be artificially formed, but a growing relationship to be recognized and afforded ways of practical expression. None of us would advocate, as none of us could enter, a fellowship that would compromise loyalty to the truth as any one of us may see it, or would stifle freedom to bear testimony to its worth and power. What appeals to us is the challenge of a great adventure to prove that a common purpose to share the faith of Christ is a power strong enough to break the fetters of custom and timidity and sectarian jealousy that hitherto have put asunder Christian brethren who at heart are one, and who can better serve the Kingdom of God together than apart.

The Protestant churches of America are learning to work together. By so doing they honour their heritage and fulfil their mission. The Congregational and Universalist Churches

are branches of the same parent stock. They grew out of the same soil and are bearing the same kind of fruit. The historic reasons for their separation have practically disappeared and new and stronger reasons for union have arisen. In statement of faith, in form of worship, in organization for work, and in standards of life, these two branches of Protestantism differ now in no essential respects. They can accordingly begin at once to co-operate in the heartiest way. If the prayer of our Lord is ever to be fulfilled, the beginning will be made by the mutual approach of denominations between which there is no longer any reason for separation.

In the judgment of the commissions, the time has arrived for the Congregational and Universalist Churches to seek the closest practicable fellowship. Their activities are proceeding already along lines closely parallel. They can do many things together to advantage which they are now doing separately. Each church will be quickened through this free fellowship.

We therefore recommend:

First: That the ministers and representatives of each denomination be invited to sit as corresponding members in the local, state, and national associations of the other denomination and to participate in their deliberations.

Second: That the agencies of each denomination in the realms of religious education, social service, evangelism, rural church development, and similar problems, be urged to arrange for joint programmes for promotion as far as practicable.

Third: That in each community where churches of both denominations are found they be urged to study what they can do together with mutual profit by way of union services, the interchange of pulpits, and the promotion of common enterprises.

Fourth: That there be a mutual interchange of representative speakers at national, state, and local gatherings.

Fifth: That the denominational journals be urged to make the largest practicable interchange of editorials and of printed matter of common interest, in order that each constituency may be kept fully informed regarding the other and of the progress made in the direction of closer fellowship.

Sixth: That, in order to secure more thoroughly co-ordinated movements, no actual steps toward the organization of local Congregational and Universalist churches be made without consulting their respective commissions.

Seventh: Wherever the problem of an adequate church constituency presses for solution, and in any community where denominational divisions work for wastefulness, those responsible are urged to co-operate in organizing for more effective service.

We believe that from these and similar joint undertakings increased effectiveness in common tasks and even more will result. Comradeship in a common faith and loyalty will be its finest and most prophetic grace. That quickened sense of comradeship will fashion its own ecclesiastical instrumentalities. None of us can yet foresee clearly what sort of organized fellowship will arise to give form and coherence to the spiritual unity that Christians of the open mind gladly confess. We are convinced that it will be something larger and more inclusive than anything that now exists. What we do see, with a profound feeling of gratitude and responsibility, is that, in the providence of God, these communions which we represent have been led by their respective historic traditions and spiritual development to a common faith in the Christian way of life as their supreme concern. They would travel it not only as friends but as allies, with a spirit as inclusive as the mind of the Master.

In such a larger fellowship Congregationalists and Universalists alike, both as churches and individuals, may find fresh incentive to service and sacrifice. The Kingdom of God requires the uttermost loyalty and devotion of both and the mutual recognition of what each may contribute to the common endeavour. The stirring challenge to forward-looking Christians of whatever name to-day is to make their churches vitalizing centers of the Christianity that is in Christ, and so to promote the broader fellowship through which alone the mighty task of winning the world by the Master shall be accomplished. To that we commit ourselves. The event is in the hand of God.

[From *The Congregationalist,* Boston, Mass.]

BOOK REVIEWS

UNITED CHURCHES. By Elizabeth R. Hooker. New York: George H. Doran Company; 306 pages; price, $2.75.

The thoroughness of this volume attracts attention at once. Its material was gathered as a part of the comprehensive study of American agricultural villages, conducted by the Institute of Social and Religious Research. This organization dates back to January, 1921. In its work it combines the scientific method with the religious motive. While it is an independent organization, it co-operates freely with other social and religious agencies. It has been long recognized that American villages — that is, centers of less than 5000 people — have been dreadfully overchurched — more so than any other type of community, and the problems arising therefrom have often been of grave concern to village inhabitants. The primary object of this study was to investigate the united churches of several different types that had arisen as substitutes for the competing denominational churches found in so many American villages. There are as many as six different kinds of community churches, communities experimenting according to local conditions. The area covered in this study includes thirty states from New England to the Pacific coast. The Southern States are omitted because there are very few united churches there.

The churches surveyed represent all types of union, with a few examples of combinations approaching union and several cases of abandoned experiments, also typical conditions under which united churches develop and stages of union and different degrees of amalgamation. The survey deals with more cases of strength than of weakness and gives particular mention to examples of successes, although omitting the names of the churches because the survey deals primarily with tendencies rather than geographical locations, which is to be commended.

The book is divided into four parts: I, development of united churches; II, federated, undenominational, denominational, and affiliated churches; III, problems; and, IV, adjustments, with a valuable appendix. There were but three undenominational churches prior to 1890, the earliest federated church being formed in 1887. In 1924 the number was 977, while now it has gone considerably over 1,000. As they arose out of these four methods of union, they formed two organizations, one being interpreted by its organ, *The Community Churchman*, and the other — the Fundamentalist group — being interpreted by *The Pioneer of a New Era*. The Congregationalists, Presbyterians, Methodists, and Baptists lead in the activities of these churches with nearly all of the other denominations falling in line according

to local representation. The facts are so well presented and the whole field is so ably covered that the book will hold a place of primary importance in any study of the united church in the American villages, where removals of inhabitants and economic conditions are demanding some sort of adjustment for the religious life of the community.

CAN THE CHURCHES UNITE? A Symposium Published Under the Auspices of the World Conference on Faith and Order. New York and London: The Century Company; 230 pages; price, $1.25.

This is just such a volume as one would want to put in his satchel for his next trip, whether it is a long trip or a short one. It is attractively printed and invites reading. There are nineteen contributors — Bishop Charles H. Brent of the Episcopalians, Dr. W. P. Merrill of the Presbyterians, Bishop Francis J. McConnell of the Methodists, President E. Y. Mullins of the Baptists, Rev. Martin J. Scott of the Roman Catholics, Dr. W. E. Barton of the Congregationalists, Dr. F. H. Knubel of the Lutherans, Dr. A. W. Fortune of the Disciples, Editor A. M. Kerr of the Christians, Dr. T. A. Moore of the United Church of Canada, and others. These nineteen men are looking toward better conditions in the Church than are revealed now by its divisions. Each has his own approach, sometimes interpreting his denominational position and, in other instances, speaking out of his own experience. Each contribution is brief, but satisfactory, clearly showing where the writer is in the universal throbbing throughout the Church for a united Christendom.

It calls to mind a similar symposium that appeared in 1896, being five lectures delivered at Union Theological Seminary, New York, by Prof. Charles W. Shields of the Presbyterians, President E. B. Andrews of the Baptists, Bishop John F. Hurst of the Methodists, Bishop Henry C. Potter of the Episcopalians, and Dr. Amory H. Bradford of the Congregationalists. After reading this book for the second time and comparing it with *Can the Churches Unite?* one is not only led to observe that we have made progress in our thinking through the past thirty years, but to ask the question after all these fine things have been said, Why can't we unite?

The putting out of this little book is opportune. The World Conference on Faith and Order will meet at Lausanne this summer, dealing directly with the problems of a united Church. Many of these who contribute to this volume will attend. They will take part in the conference. This is a sample of how men will think when they get in the conference room. Perhaps fellowship will carry them beyond where they are now, for Christian fellowship is a mighty power in quickening approaches. Let us hope so and this little book will have helped.

YOUTH AND CHRISTIAN UNITY. By Walter W. Van Kirk, Associate Secretary, Commission on International Justice and Goodwill, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. New York: George H. Doran Company; 267 pages; price, $2.00.

The author of this book is a young man whose sympathetic attitude and wide understanding have enabled him to give to the public one of the best Christian unity books of the year. The first chapter is so timely that we asked permission of the author and publisher for the use of it, and it will be found in this number of *The Christian Union Quarterly*. It is a fair sample of the whole book. The other chapters deal with the practical necessity of unity, conditions determining youth's viewpoint, the present day interchurch approach to young people, Christian unity in the United States and other countries, world movements and youth's opportunity. It covers the field admirably and puts one in possession of most desirable information concerning the rise of Christian unity movements and youth's reason for encouragement by the story of the past. Mr. Van Kirk calls for a restudy of the most convincing book on Christian unity—the New Testament—and challenges youth to begin the healing in their various denominations, organizations, and interdenominational groups, by the holding of conferences, especially between Protestant and Roman Catholic young people, and the convening of a world congress of Christian youth. He advocates that men be trained for interdenominational service, which these times are increasingly demanding, and he also advocates an interdenominational press, and concludes that "God has laid upon the youth of to-day the responsibility for bringing into a single fold the scattered sheep of the Good Shepherd." It is a well written book—clear, strong, and challenging.

THE SPIRIT OF CHRIST. Devotional Studies in the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit. By Prof. Charles R. Erdman, D.D., LL.D., of Princeton Theological Seminary. New York: George H. Doran Company; 119 pages; $1.50.

This book begins with the striking paragraph: "A follower of Christ should be expected to manifest in some degree the moral temper of his Master. One notably lacking in gentleness and courage, in sympathy and strength, in purity and love will hardly be classified as a Christian. We may as well apply this test to ourselves. God does; the world surely will." The seven chapters that follow deal with the abiding presence, another comforter, filled with the Spirit, Pentecost, the inspired Scriptures, the Spirit and the Church, and the Spirit and the world. Every chapter is a challenge to holier living. In discussing Christian unity, as would necessarily have to be done in discussing the Spirit and the Church, Dr. Erdman sees in unity not a union of societies or sects or denominations or churches, but a

union of individual believers, consequently the spiritual life of the Church depends upon the spiritual life of each one of its members and, if this life is to be stimulated and strengthened, this can be done only by bringing individual members into a right relation with Christ. This is the real approach to unity, agreement on all other points being of secondary importance, such as unanimity of belief, uniformity of worship, etc. This book is suited for a place in every devotional library, for there can be no proper study of devotion without some study of the Holy Spirit, and Dr. Erdman has made a worth while contribution to the most important subject having to do with spiritual life.

AN INTEGRATED PROGRAM OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION. By W. A. Harper, President of Elon College, N. C. New York: The Macmillan Company; 152 pages; $1.75.

There is no more important and immediate duty facing the Church than to seek earnestly for an integrated program of religious education. The purpose of this volume is to present such a program rather than the principles involved. Dr. Harper maintains that the best bond of integration will be found in common attitudes and ideals and not in subject matter regarded as a body of knowledge. In the ten chapters he has crowded most interesting information dealing with the whole field of religious education. In the present situation there are a multiplicity of organizations, such as sixteen interdenominational agencies, eighteen non-denominational agencies, and fourteen denominational agencies, which is an illustration of over-organization. Some of these agencies put the emphasis on instruction, others on expression, and still others on research. He rightly argues for integration into a single unified process, urging, for instance, that all the interdenominational boards and organizations working in the general field of religious education should merge themselves in the International Council, after which the International Council should become the department of Christian Education of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

It is indeed true, as he affirms, that unity is necessary in a statesman-like approach to the teaching problem of the Church, and to that end the proposed remedies for the present disorder and disorganization gather themselves under three general heads: Co-operation, correlation, and integration. These he considers at length, especially emphasizing integration in the Sunday-schools and a curriculum which will bind the instruction laid out to be given on Sunday with that prescribed for the Week Day Schools of Religion and the Daily Vacation Bible Schools, so that they will interlock and supplement and re-enforce one another. Dr. Harper discusses every phase of religious education, including the work of the General Educational Boards, colleges, worship, the social order, Christian Endeavour,

giving, the home, evangelism, community programs, books and reading courses, the budget, leadership, and other phases of human experience. It is a most interesting and carefully prepared volume on one of the most vital problems of these times. It is sufficient to say that Dr. Harper is a prophet in this field both as author and editor, aside from his pre-eminent service as president of one of the leading colleges of his denomination.

The constant appearance of devotional books is one of the most hopeful interpretations of these times. People are thinking in terms of relationship with God. Four of the best type of these publications are *Concerning the Inner Life*, by Evelyn Underhill (E. P. Dutton & Company, New York); *Modern Prayers*, by Samuel McComb, D.D. (Longmans, Green & Co., New York and London, $1.50); *The Quiet Hour*—Experiences of Fellowship in Worship, recorded by William Adams Brown (Association Press, New York); and *The Song of Meditation*—a Meditation, a Poem, a Prayer by Robert MacGowan (Fleming H. Revell Company, New York and Chicago, $1.25). The little volume by Miss Underhill contains three addresses which she delivered to a group of clergymen of the Liverpool diocese, having special reference to the needs, difficulties, and duties of a busy parish priest, but many of these problems are the same with all people. She wisely warns against that unselfishness which spends itself in serving others. We must have leisure for the contemplation of the strength and love of God. It is a beautiful book. Dr. McComb's book is a collection of sixty prayers and readings by modern writers, ranging from Cardinal Newman to William James and Dean Inge, with an introductory essay on the meaning and value of prayer, which is one of the best essays on this subject we have ever read —strong, true, and devotional. It is a book that one would like to re-read many times. In the instance of Dr. Brown's book it is the outcome of an experiment in social worship which has been carried on in the chapel of Union Theological Seminary, New York, during two successive years. The prayers, which have been tested, are grouped about familiar passages of Scripture, each chosen because it expresses some permanent human aspiration or speaks to some recurrent human need. It would be a most helpful book for group practice, where each worshiper would find opportunity to meditate in silent worship. It is a book of real practical service. Dr. MacGowan's book combines meditation, poetry, and prayer for daily devotions, dealing with God, Jesus, the Holy Spirit, and humanity. The variety of treatment of the main themes awakens interest and helps toward finding the devotional attitude of mind so essential to the true worshiper.

The Christian Union Quarterly

INTERDENOMINATIONAL AND
INTERNATIONAL

Volume XVI

JULY, 1926, TO APRIL, 1927

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

Adams, Clinton Baltzell. Orthodox Hearts 20
Aim and Scope of the World Conference, The — Bishop Edward L. Parsons, D.D. 119
Ainslie, D.D., Peter. The Editor's Notes—
Barriers Named and Their Remedies 230
Barriers to Unity and Their Removal, The 229
Christian Unity and Education 341
Community Co-operation 9
Expression of Growing Unity, An 7
Federal Council and the Churches of Europe, The 11
International Co-operation 11
Is Co-operation an Expense or an Economy? 9
Laboratory for Needed Experiment, A 7
Range of Service 8
Shall We Federate the Federations? 10
Summary, The 241
Three-fold Approach 117
Tide Toward Unity, The 117
Unity in Diversity 8
Voluntary Service 12
Why of Federal Union, The 5
World Conference on Faith and Order, The 342
American Friend, The (Richmond, Ind.). The Federal Council Through the Eyes of the Religious Press 68
American Israelite, The. As a Jew Sees It 422
Anderson, Bishop C. P. Barriers Named and Their Remedies 231
Antidote, The. Motion of Protestant Groups Toward Unity Pleasing to Roman Catholics 398
As a Jew Sees It—The American Israelite 422
Ashworth, D.D., Robert A. Realism in Conference 156
Attitude of Educated India Toward Christianity, The—Shoran S. Singha 80

Babcock, Maltbie D. Be Strong! 38
Banninga, M.A., D.D., John J. The Missionary Aspect of Doctrinal Unity 176
Baptists and Church Union, The—Professor Douglas Clyde Macintosh. 419
Barnford, Rev. George K. The Federal Council Through the Eyes of the Religious Press 69
Barriers Named and Their Remedies (The Editor's Notes)—Dr. John R. Mott, Dr. Henry van Dyke, Dean Charles R. Brown, Bishop C. P. Anderson, Dr. Raymond Calkins, Dr. William P. Merrill, Dr.

PAGE

S. D. Chown, Bishop Edward L. Parsons, Principal W. B. Selbie, Very Rev. Dr. J. A. McClymont, Dr. Francis E. Clark, Dr. Samuel McComb, Prof. Dr. J. Eugene Choisy, Bishop Boyd Vincent, Dr. William Adams Brown, Dean Winfred Ernest Garrison, Bishop William F. McDowell, Dr. Finis S. Idleman, President Geo. W. Richards, Dr. Nehemiah Boynton, Dr. Joseph A. Vance, Dr. A. W. Fortune, President W. A. Harper 230

Barriers to Unity and Their Removal, The—The Editor's Notes 229

Be Strong!—Maltbie D. Babcock 38

Bombay, Bishop of. Proposals for Unity in India 188

Boynton, Dr. Nehemiah. Barriers Named and Their Remedies 239

Brent, Bishop Charles H. Unity as a Missionary End 427

Brown, Dean Charles R. Barriers Named and Their Remedies 230

Brown, D.D., William Adams. Barriers Named and Their Remedies .. 238

Brown, D.D., William Adams. The Soul of the Federal Council 13

Cadman, D.D., S. Parkes. Finding Our Unity in Common Service 77

Cadman, D.D., S. Parkes. The Growth of American Church Federation 35

Can America Help the Near Eastern Churches?—Dr. John R. Voris .. 91

Can the Bible Be the Basis of Christian Union?—Dean W. J. Lhamon. 380

Calkins, Dr. Raymond. Barriers Named and Their Remedies 232

Call to Christian Union, The—Rev. Ralph V. Hinkle 245

Cavert, Samuel McCrea. What True Tolerance Is 98

Challenge of a Pilgrim Faith, The—R. Edis Fairbairn, D.D. 163

Cheng, Rev. C. Y. The Federal Council Through Foreign Eyes 73

Choisy, Prof. Dr. J. Eugene. Barriers Named and Their Remedies 236

Chown, Dr. S. D. Barriers Named and Their Remedies 233

Christian Century, The. Community Church Workers Meet 102

Christian Council of India, Burma, and Ceylon—The Indian Social Reformer 415

Christian Unity—The Ideal of Youth for the Church—Walter W. Van Kirk 367

Christian Unity and Education—The Editor's Notes 341

Christian Unity in Practice—The Federal Council Bulletin 99

Christianson, The Hon. Theodore. A Layman's View of Christian Service Through Co-operation 46

Church Federation a Necessity—Rev. Edward Tallmadge Root 27

Church and World Unity, The—James Endicott, D.D. 95

Church the Mother of Us All, The—The Lutheran 326

Church Union and the Question of Creed in Australia—Rev. Andrew R. Osborn 268

Church's New Major Interest, The—Rev. Charles Lloyd Garrison 297

Clark, Dr. Francis E. Barriers Named and Their Remedies 235

Clark, Thomas Curtis. God Is! 394

Clark, Thomas Curtis. Wanderers 45

Climbers, The—Dombey Shepherd 296

Clippinger, Bishop A. R. The Practice of Comity 97

Community Church, The—Rev. George A. Wickwire 75

Community Church Workers Meet—The Christian Century 102

Community Co-operation—The Editor's Notes 9

PAGE
Coolidge, President—The Federal Council Through the Eyes of Laymen 65
Cross Currents in the Tide of Christian Unity—Rev. Floyd W. Tomkins, Jr. 313

Daily Herald (Passaic, N. J.). The Federal Council Through the Eyes of Laymen 67
Davies, Rev. Gwilym. The Federal Council Through Foreign Eyes... 71
Delany, Dr. Selden Peabody. The Episcopal-Catholic Movement..... 87
Disclosure—Charles R. Wakeley..... 280
Downey, Rev. Richard. Reflections on Reunion 416
Dumm, Ph.D., B. Alfred. Issues Relating to Faith..... 139

Editor's Notes, The..... 5, 117, 229, 341
Endicott, D.D., James. If Leaders Were as Courageous as They are Conservative 212
Endicott, D.D., James. Religion and World Unity 205
Endicott, D.D., James. The Church and World Unity..... 95
Episcopal-Catholic Movement, The—Dr. Selden Peabody Delany..... 87
Expression of Growing Unity, An—The Editor's Notes..... 7

Fairbairn, D.D., R. Edis. The Challenge of a Pilgrim Faith..... 163
Faith and Mystery of Conference, The—Rev. Herbert Kelly..... 170
Faith and Order—The Guardian..... 185
Faith and Order—The Guardian..... 424
Federal Council Bulletin, The. Christian Unity in Practice 99
Federal Council Bulletin, The. The Federal Council Through the Eyes of the Religious Press..... 70
Federal Council and the Churches of Europe, The—The Editor's Notes. 11
Federal Council Through Foreign Eyes, The—Sir Henry Lunn, Rev. Gwilym Davies, Harry N. Holmes, Professor F. Zilka, Rev. C. Y. Cheng, Dr. Julius Richter, Bishop John L. Nuelsen..... 71
Federal Council Through the Eyes of Church Leaders, The—Bishop Thomas Nicholson, Rev. John Smith Lowe, Professor C. B. Wilmer, Professor Thornton Whaling, Rev. Rockwell H. Potter, Bishop Francis J. McConnell.. 62
Federal Council Through the Eyes of Laymen, The—President Coolidge, Ex-Governor William E. Sweet, Harvey S. Firestone, Hon. Elihu Root, Major General John F. O'Ryan, Daily Herald (Passaic, N.J.), The Times (Chester, Pa.)..... 65
Federal Council Through the Eyes of the Religious Press, The—The American Friend, The Presbyterian Advance, The Christian Work, The Herald of Gospel Liberty, The Federal Council Bulletin..... 68
Finding Our Unity in Common Service—Dr. S. Parkes Cadman..... 77
Firestone, Harvey S. The Federal Council Through the Eyes of Laymen 66
Fortune, Dr. A. W. Barriers Named and Their Remedies..... 240

Gage-Brown, L. The Monks of Unity..... 395
Garrison, Rev. Charles Lloyd. The Church's New Major Interest..... 297
Garrison, Dean Winfred Ernest. Barriers Named and Their Remedies. 238

PAGE

Garvie, M.A., D.D., Principal Alfred E. Recent Conferences Between the Church of England and the Free Churches 127
God Is;—Thomas Curtis Clark 394
Growth of American Church Federation, The—S. Parkes Cadman, D.D. 35
Guardian, The. Faith and Order 185
Guardian, The. Faith and Order 424
Guardian, The. The Need of Unity 183
Guild, D.D., Roy B. The Present Status of Local Federation 39

Haley, Molly Anderson. Intolerance 267
Hall, D.D., Francis J. Need of Mutual Education 426
Hall, D.D., Francis J. Requirements for Reunion 281
Harper, President W. A. Barriers Named and Their Remedies 241
Herald of Gospel Liberty, The. Local Church Co-operation 423
Herald of Gospel Liberty, The. The Federal Council Through the Eyes of the Religious Press 69
Herald of Gospel Liberty, The. There Must Be a Better Way 420
Hinkle, Rev. Ralph V. The Call to Christian Union 245
Hodgkin, D.D., Henry T. The Problem of Christian Unity in China ... 345
Holmes, Harry N. The Federal Council Through Foreign Eyes 72
Homans, D.D., Rockland T. Report on Christian Unity. 1926 361
How the Federal Council Can Best Serve the Churches — Robert E. Speer, D.D. 21
Hughes, Hon. Charles Evans. Main Purpose of the World Conference 403

Idleman, Dr. Finis S. Barriers Named and Their Remedies 238
If Leaders Were as Courageous as They Are Conservative — James Endicott, D.D. 212
Indian Social Reformer, The—Christian Council of India, Burma, and Ceylon 415
Ingham, B.D., Rev. H. L. The Reunion Impasse 328
International Co-operation—The Editor's Notes 11
Intolerance—Molly Anderson Haley 267
Is Church Union Attainable?—George W. Richards, D.D., LL.D. 253
Is Co-operation an Expense or an Economy?—The Editor's Notes 9
Issues Relating to Faith—B. Alfred Dumm, Ph.D. 139
Issues Relating to Order and Polity—Frank K. Sanders, Ph.D. 148

Joint Statement on Interchurch Relations from the Commissions of the Congregational and Universalist Churches, A 431

Kelly, Rev. Herbert. The Faith and Mystery of Conference 170

Laboratory for Needed Experiment, A—The Editor's Notes 7
Last Letters of Cardinal Mercier to Archbishop of Canterbury—Rev. C. H. Palmer 202
Layman's View of Christian Service Through Co-operation, A—The Hon. Theodore Christianson 46

PAGE
Lhamon, Dean W. J. Can the Bible Be the Basis of Christian Union?. 380
Living Church, The. Should We Be Afraid of Lausanne?..... 399
Living Church, The. The Unity Movement in India as Seen By an Episcopal Editor..... 194
Local Church Co-operation—The Herald of Gospel Liberty..... 423
Lowe, Rev. John Smith. The Federal Council Through the Eyes of Church Leaders..... 63
Lunn, Sir Henry. The Federal Council Through Foreign Eyes..... 71
Lutheran, The. The Church the Mother of Us All..... 326
Lynch, Dr. Frederick. The Federal Council Through the Eyes of the Religious Press..... 69

Macintosh, Prof. Douglas Clyde. The Baptists and Church Union..... 419
Main Purpose of the World Conference—Hon. Charles Evans Hughes.. 403
Markham, Edwin. The Testing..... 379
McClymont, Very Rev. Dr. J. A. Barriers Named and Their Remedies 235
McComb, Dr. Samuel. Barriers Named and Their Remedies..... 236
McConnell, Bishop Francis J. The Federal Council Through the Eyes of Church Leaders..... 65
McDowell, Bishop William F. Barriers Named and Their Remedies... 238
Members of Christ's Body—George C. Pidgeon, D.D..... 49
Merrill, Dr. William P. Barriers Named and Their Remedies..... 232
Merrill, Dr. William P. O Men of God!..... 356
Missionary Aspect of Doctrinal Unity, The—John J. Banninga, M.A., D.D..... 176
Monks of Unity, The—L. Gage-Brown..... 395
Motion of Protestant Groups Toward Unity Pleasing to Roman Catholics—The Antidote..... 398
Mott, Dr. John R. Barriers Named and Their Remedies..... 230

National Christian Council of China, The—Samuel J. Skevington..... 404
Need of Mutual Education—Francis J. Hall, D.D..... 426
Need of Unity, The—The Guardian..... 183
Nicholson, Bishop Thomas. The Federal Council Through the Eyes of Church Leaders..... 62
Not Enough to Desire Union; One Must Work for It—Abbé Portal.... 185
Nuelsen, Bishop John L. The Federal Council Through Foreign Eyes. 75

O Men of God!—Dr. William P. Merrill..... 356
Orthodox Hearts—Clinton Baltzell Adams..... 20
O'Ryan, Major General John F. The Federal Council Through the Eyes of Laymen..... 67
Osborn, Rev. Andrew R. Church Union and the Question of Creed in Australia..... 268
Oxenham, John. The Sacrament of Love..... 26

Palmer, Rev. C. H. Last Letters of Cardinal Mercier to Archbishop of Canterbury..... 202
Parsons, D.D., Bishop Edward L. Barriers Named and Their Remedies 233

PAGE

Parsons, D.D., Bishop Edward L. The Aim and Scope of the World Conference 119
Pidgeon, D.D., George C. Members of Christ's Body..... 49
Portal, Abbé. Not Enough to Desire Union; One Must Work for It... 185
Potter, Rev. Rockwell H. The Federal Council Through the Eyes of Church Leaders 65
Practice of Comity, The—Bishop A. R. Clippinger..... 97
Present Status of Local Federation, The—Roy B. Guild, D.D. 39
Problem of Christian Unity in China, The—Henry T. Hodgkin, D.D. .. 345
Proposals for Unity in India—Bishop of Bombay..... 188
Protestant Orders and Sacraments—Principal W. B. Selbie..... 198

Range of Service—The Editor's Notes..... 8
Realism in Conference—Robert A. Ashworth, D.D. 156
Recent Conferences Between the Church of England and the Free Churches—Principal Alfred E. Garvie, M.A., D.D. 127
Reflections on Reunion—Rev. Richard Downey..... 416
Religion and World Unity—Rev. James Endicott, D.D. 205
Report on Christian Unity. 1926—Rockland J. Homans, D.D. 361
Requirements for Reunion—Francis J. Hall, D.D. 281
Reunion Impasse, The—Rev. H. L. Ingham, B.D. 328
Richard, Rev. M. H. Unity Conference in Cairo..... 409
Richards, D.D., LL.D., Geo. W. Barriers Named and Their Remedies .. 239
Richards, D.D., LL.D., Geo. W. Is Church Union Attainable?..... 253
Richter, Dr. Julius. The Federal Council Through Foreign Eyes..... 74
Root, Rev. Edward Tallmadge. Church Federation a Necessity..... 27
Root, Hon. Elihu. The Federal Council Through the Eyes of Laymen. 67

Sacrament of Love, The—John Oxenham..... 26
Sanders, Ph.D., Frank K. Issues Relating to Order and Polity..... 148
Sanderson, Ross W. What a Local Church Council Tries To Do..... 101
Scotford, Rev. John R. Week-Day Instruction and Religious Unity.... 357
Secretarial Staff of the Federal Council, With Present Position and Dates of Beginning Service With the Council..... 60
Selbie, Principal W. B. Barriers Named and Their Remedies 234
Selbie, Principal W. B. Protestant Orders and Sacraments 198
Shall We Federate the Federations?—The Editor's Notes..... 10
Shepherd, Dombey. The Climbers..... 296
Should We Be Afraid of Lausanne?—The Living Church..... 399
Singha, Shoran S. The Attitude of Educated India Toward Christianity 80
Skevington, Samuel J. The National Christian Council of China..... 404
Some Conditions of Reunion—Canon E. S. Woods..... 322
Soul of the Federal Council, The—William Adams Brown, D.D. 13
Speer, D.D., Robert E. How the Federal Council Can Best Serve the Churches 21
Summary, The—The Editor's Notes..... 241
Sweet, Ex-Governor William E. The Federal Council Through the Eyes of Laymen..... 66

PAGE
Tasker, D.D., J. G. "Una Sancta" 277
Testing, The—Edwin Markham 379
There Must Be a Better Way—The Herald of Gospel Liberty 420
Three-fold Approach—The Editor's Notes 117
Tide Toward Unity, The—The Editor's Notes 117
Times, The (Chester, Pa.). The Federal Council Through the Eyes of Laymen 67
Tomkins, Jr., Rev. Floyd W. Cross Currents in the Tide of Christian Unity 313

"Una Sancta"—J. G. Tasker, D.D. 277
Unity As a Missionary End—Bishop Charles H. Brent 427
Unity Conference in Cairo—Rev. M. H. Richard 409
Unity in Diversity—The Editor's Notes 8
Unity Movement in India as Seen by an Episcopal Editor, The—The Living Church 194

Vance, Dr. Joseph A. Barriers Named and Their Remedies 240
Van Dyke, Dr. Henry. Barriers Named and Their Remedies 231
Van Kirk, Walter W. Christian Unity—The Ideal of Youth for the Church 367
Vincent, Bishop Boyd. Barriers Named and Their Remedies 237
Voluntary Service—The Editor's Notes 12
Voris, Dr. John R. Can America Help the Near Eastern Churches? .. 91

Wakeley, Charles R. Disclosure 280
Wanderers—Thomas Curtis Clark 45
Week-Day Instruction and Religious Unity—Rev. John R. Scotford ... 357
Whaling, Professor Thornton. The Federal Council Through the Eyes of Church Leaders 64
What a Local Church Council Tries To Do—Ross W. Sanderson 101
What People and Papers Are Saying 62, 183, 313, 395
What True Tolerance Is—Samuel McCrea Cavert 98
Why of Federal Union, The—The Editor's Notes 5
Wickwire, Rev. George A. The Community Church 75
Wilmer, Professor C. B. The Federal Council Through the Eyes of Church Leaders 63
Woods, Canon E. S. Some Conditions of Reunion 322
World Conference on Faith and Order, The—The Guardian 342

Zilka, Professor F. The Federal Council Through Foreign Eyes 73

BOOKS REVIEWED

PAGE

Anglicanism, An Introduction to its History and Philosophy—Carnegie 219
Can the Churches Unite? A Symposium Published Under the Auspices of the World Conference on Faith and Order 435
Cardinal Mercier—Goyau 331
Church of the Spirit, The. A Brief Survey of the Spiritual Tradition in Christianity—Peabody 216
Concerning the Inner Life—Underhill 438
Confusion of the Churches, The—Mackenzie 213
Development of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, The—Garvie 334
Foundations of Faith. III Ecclesiological—Orchard 224
Group Spirit in Church Life, The—Slater 335
Integrated Program of Religious Education, An—Harper 437
Mathilda Wrede of Finland, Friend of Prisoners—Stevenson 110
Modern Prayers—McComb 438
One Body and the One Spirit, The. A Study in the Unity of the Church—Lacey 215
Paul of Tarsus—Glover 109
Preaching in Theory and Practice—McComb 334
Putting on Immortality. Reflections on the Life Beyond—Macartney. 112
Quiet Hour, The—Experiences of Fellowship in Worship—Brown 438
Reasonableness of Christianity, The—Macintosh 107
Recollections and Reflections—Smyth 332
Shall We Have a Creed?—Sneath 221
Sectarian Shackles—Travers 335
Song of Meditation, The—a Meditation, a Poem, a Prayer—MacGowan 438
Soul of Religion and Other Addresses, The—Castleberry 336
Spirit of Christ, The. Devotional Studies in the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit—Erdman 436
Statement Covering Ordination to the Ministery, Issued by the United Church of Canada, A 220
Studies in the Forgiveness of Sins—Kellems 111
Supremacy of the Spiritual, The. Essays Toward the Understanding and Attainment of Spiritual Personality—Yountz 106
Thinking Through. Facts and Principles to Clarify the Controversial Thinking in the Church—Kerr 111
Toward Interracial Co-operation. What Was Said and Done at the First National Interracial Conference. Held under the auspices of the Commission of the Church and Race Relations of the Federal Council of the Churches and the Commission on Interracial Co-operation, Cincinnati, Ohio, March 25-27, 1925 105
Treading the Winepress—Connor 112
United Churches—Hooker 434
What the Churches of Christ Stand For—Robinson 112
Youth and Christian Unity—Van Kirk 436

Organizations for the Promotion of Christian Unity

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF CHRISTIAN UNITY, Inc. Having its inception in the Work of Thomas Campbell, a Presbyterian Minister of Washington, Pa., 1809; present organization, 1910. President, Rev. Levi G. Batman, Youngstown, Ohio; Secretary, Rev. H. C. Armstrong, 230 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore, Md., U. S. A. For intercessory prayer, friendly conferences, and distribution of irenic literature—"till we all attain unto the unity of the faith." Pentecost Sunday is the day named for special prayers for, and sermons on, Christian Unity in all Churches.

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF THE UNITY OF CHRISTENDOM, 1857. President, Athelstan Riley, Esq., 2 Kensington Court, London; Secretary in the United States, Rev. Calbraith Bourn Perry, Cambridge, N. Y. For intercessory prayer for the reunion of the Roman Catholic, Greek, and Anglican Communions.

CHRISTIAN UNITY ASSOCIATION OF SCOTLAND, 1903, Secretary, Rev. Robert W Weir, Edinburgh. For maintaining, fostering, and expressing the consciousness of the underlying unity that is shared by many members of the different Churches in Scotland.

CHRISTIAN UNITY FOUNDATION, 1910. President, Rev. Nehemiah Boynton; Secretary, Rev. Linley V. Gordon, 70 Fifth Ave., New York City. For the promotion of Christian Unity throughout the world by research and conference.

CHURCHMAN'S UNION, 1898. President, Prof. Percy Gardner; Secretary, Rev. John H. Bentley, Souldern Rectory, Banbury, England. For cultivation of friendly relations between the Church of England and all other Christian Communions.

CONTINUATION COMMITTEE OF THE WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER, 1910. Chairman, Rt. Rev. Charles H. Brent; Secretariat, P. O. Box 226, Boston, Mass, U. S. A. For a world conference of all Christians relative to the unity of Christendom.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON ORGANIC UNION, 1918. Ad Interim Committee— Chairman, Rev. Joseph A. Vance, Detroit, Mich.; Secretary, Rev. Rufus W. Miller, Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia. For the organic union of the Evangelical Churches in the United States of America.

FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA, 1908. President, Dr. S. Parkes Cadman; Secretary, Rev. Charles S. Macfarland, 105 E. 22nd St., New York. For the co-operation of the various Protestant Communions in service, rather than an attempt to unite upon definitions of theology and polity.

FREE CHURCH FELLOWSHIP, 1911. Rev. Malcolm Spencer, Bryn Melyn, Harrow Weald, Middlesex. For the cultivation of corporate prayer and thought for a new spiritual fellowship and communion with all branches of the Christian Church.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE EVANGELICAL FREE CRURCHES OF ENGLAND, 1895. President, Rev. H. Elvet Lewis, M. A., 37 Highbury, New Park, N. 5, London. Secretary, Rev. Thomas Nightingale, Memorial Hall, Farringdon Street, E. C. 4, London. For facilitating fraternal intercourse and co-operation among the Evangelical Free Churches in England.

UNIVERSAL CHRISTIAN CONFERENCE ON LIFE AND WORK, 1920. Chairmen, Archbishop of Upsala, Archbishop of Canterbury, Patriarch of Constantinople, and Rev. A. J Brown; Secretary, Rev. Henry A. Atkinson, 70 Fifth Ave., New York City. For union of the Churches in common, practical work, and to insist that the principles of the Gospel be applied to the solution of contemporary social and international problems.

WORLD ALLIANCE FOR PROMOTING INTERNATIONAL FRIENDSHIP THROUGH THE CHURCHES, 1914. Chairman, Most Rev. Randall Thomas Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury; Hon. Secretary, Rt. Hon. Sir Willoughby H. Dickinson, 41 Parliament St., London, S. W. 1; Chairman, American Council, Rev. William P. Merrill; General Secretary Rev. Henry A. Atkinson, 70 Fifth Ave., New York City. For joint endeavour to achieve the promotion of international friendship through the Churches and the avoidance of war.

WORLD'S EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE, 1846; Incorporated 1912. Chairman, Sir Andrew Wingate; General Secretary, Henry Martyn Gooch, 19 Russell Sqr., London, W. C. 1. To enable Christians of British and foreign nations to realize in themselves, and to manifest to others, that living and essential union which binds together all believers in the fellowship of Christ. Universal Week of prayer organized by the Alliance since 1846.

PRINTED IN UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY THE
HESS PRINTING COMPANY
BALTIMORE, MD.

CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY
1926-1927

DATE	ISSUED TO